

JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1933

# Clearing House

JANUARY



## *Bunk in Education*

ARTHUR D. WHITMAN, Chairman

*Editorial: Let's Own Up*

*The Research Rabbit*

*On the Spot*

*Education of Grandeur*

*Education and the Production Line*

*The Camp All for Everything*

*Education That Makes a Difference*

*Quantity or Quality?*

*The Idea That Health Can Be Taught*

*Bunk in Higher Education*

*H. E. Dewey, T. L. Schultz, Paul E. Hunsicker, William H. Kilpatrick,*

*Charles P. Allen, Henry D. Adams*

*A. D. Whitman*

*R. W. L. Calk*

*H. H. Spess*

*Thomas G. Paul*

*Lawrence A. Smith*

*Clara E. Miller*

*E. L. Cushman*

*Lester Spangenberg*

*Samuel H. Hays*

*William H. Kilpatrick*

Vol. VII, No. 5

1933

THE JOURNAL FOR PROGRESSIVE  
JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

# THE UNIT PLAN

*of Teaching English is an Outstanding Feature in*

## McKITRICK AND WEST'S ENGLISH COMPOSITION

**T**HIS is the only textbook for the first two years of high school English that is organized in units of work. It sets up worth-while **units** of investigation and research that satisfy the active growing mind of adolescence; **units** that develop social consciousness; **units** that insure the functional presentation of grammar and prepare for the creative writing of the upper high school years.

This **unit** plan relieves the teacher of the burden of organization, assignment-making and explanation. The work throughout is sufficiently flexible to meet different degrees of pupil-ability.

COMPLETE BOOK ....\$1.44  
WORKBOOK ..... .56

BOOK I .....\$1.08  
WORKBOOK ..... .36  
TEACHER'S MANUAL .48

BOOK II .....\$1.12  
WORKBOOK ..... .36  
TEACHER'S MANUAL .48

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

*the development of the junior high school has come in*

## NEXT MONTH

**Theme: *The Junior High School—An Evaluation***

George M. Wiley, assistant commissioner of education, New York State, Education Department, in "The Purpose of the Junior High School," declares that great impetus to recent years from the scientific studies of individual differences, resulting in greatly increased knowledge "regarding the marked changes, physical, psychological, and social which are taking place during adolescence, making clear many of the weaknesses of the traditional 8-4 organization." Mr. Wiley, feels that in no level of the school service is the contribution of the individual teacher more important, than in the junior high school.

Professor James M. Glass, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, in "Tested and Accepted Philosophy of the Junior-High School Movement," says that "the philosophy of the junior-high-school movement has been evolved out of the hard school of experience. It has step by step produced the materials which enact its principles into practice. Obviously both the philosophy and practice will undergo further evolutionary refinements. Yet the movement has gathered the momentum which assures its permanence."

*In writing advertisers please mention CLEARING HOUSE*

# THE CLEARING HOUSE

A journal for progressive junior and senior high-school people

## EDITORS

FORREST E. LONG  
Professor of Education  
New York University

PHILIP W. L. COX  
Professor of Education  
New York University

ARTHUR D. WHITMAN  
Professor of Education  
New York University

EARL R. GABLER  
Assistant Professor of Education  
New York University

S. O. ROREM  
Superintendent of Schools  
Port Chester, N.Y.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CHARLES FORREST ALLEN  
Supervisor of Secondary Education  
Little Rock, Ark.

RICHARD D. ALLEN  
Assistant Superintendent of Schools  
Providence, R.I.

MILDRED BATCHELDER  
Librarian Haven School  
Evanston, Ill.

LOFTER BJARNASON  
State Supervisor of Grammar  
Grades and Junior High School  
Salt Lake City, Utah

THOMAS H. BRIGGS  
Professor of Secondary Education  
Teachers College, Columbia University  
New York, N.Y.

W. H. BRISTOW  
Deputy Superintendent  
State Department of Education  
Harrisburg, Pa.

L. H. BUGBEE  
Superintendent of Schools  
West Hartford, Conn.

ERNEST W. BUTTERFIELD  
Commissioner of Education  
Hartford, Conn.

JOHN R. CLARK, Principal  
Lincoln School of Teachers College  
Columbia University, New York,  
N.Y.

CALVIN O. DAVIS  
Professor of Education  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,  
Mich.

HOWARD R. DRIGGS  
Professor of Education  
New York University

J. ANDREW DRUSHEL  
Professor of Education  
New York University

ELBERT K. FRETWELL  
Professor of Education  
Teachers College, Columbia University,  
New York, N.Y.

CHARLES M. GILL  
Professor of Education  
New York University

JAMES M. GLASS  
Rollins College  
Winter Park, Fla.

FLOYD E. HARSHMAN  
Principal of High School  
Nutley, N.J.

W. E. HAWLEY, Principal  
Monroe Junior-Senior High School  
Rochester, N.Y.

GALEN JONES  
Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Schools  
Tulsa, Okla.

LEONARD V. KOOS  
Professor of Education  
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

PAUL S. LOMAX  
Professor of Education  
New York University

HUGHES MEARNS  
Professor of Education  
New York University

ALBERT BARRETT MEREDITH  
Professor of Education  
New York University

PAUL S. MILLER, Principal  
Eastern School, East Orange, N.J.

EDWIN MILLER  
Director of Secondary Education  
Detroit, Mich.

JAY B. NASH  
Professor of Education  
New York University

MARGARET ALLTUCKER NORTON  
50 Morningside Drive  
New York City

RALPH E. PICKETT  
Professor of Education  
New York University

CHARLES J. PIEPER  
Associate Professor of Education  
New York University

WILLIAM M. PROCTOR  
Professor of Education  
Leland Stanford University  
Stanford, Calif.

L. W. RADER  
Assistant Supt. of Schools  
St. Louis, Mo.

W. C. REAVIS  
Professor of Education  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

JOSEPH ROEMER  
Professor of Education  
Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.

JOHN RUFF  
Professor of Education  
University of Missouri, Columbia,  
Mo.

EARLE U. RUGG  
Professor of Education  
Colorado State Teachers College,  
Greeley, Colo.

H. H. RYAN, Principal  
University High School  
University of Wisconsin, Madison,  
Wis.

W. CARSON RYAN, JR.  
Director of Education  
U. S. Indian Service, Washington,  
D.C.

ARTHUR M. SEYBOLD, Principal  
Oak Lane Country Day School  
Temple University, Philadelphia,  
Pa.

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING  
Graduate School of Education  
Harvard University, Cambridge,  
Mass.

JOHN L. TILDSLEY  
District Supt. of Schools  
500 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.

WILLIS L. UHL, Dean  
School of Education  
University of Washington, Seattle,  
Wash.

HARRISON H. VAN COTT  
Supervisor of Junior High Schools  
New York State Department of  
Education, Albany, N.Y.

JOSEPH K. VAN DENBURG  
New York City Board of Examiners  
500 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.

F. J. WEERSING  
Professor of Education  
University of Southern California,  
Los Angeles, Calif.

JOHN W. WITHERS, Dean  
School of Education  
New York University

Vol. VII

JANUARY, 1933

No. 5

THE CLEARING HOUSE is published by the Inor Publishing Co., Incorporated, Gordon Van Ark, Secretary, monthly from September to May of each year.  
Publication Office, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis.  
Editorial and Business Office, School of Education, New York University, Washington Square, New York, N.Y.  
Subscription price: \$3.00 per year. Two years for \$5.00 if cash accompanies order. Single copies, 40 cents. Subscriptions for less than a year will be charged at the single copy rate. For subscriptions in groups of ten or more, write for special rates.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1933, Inor Publishing Company, Incorporated

# ENGLISH DRILL . . EXERCISES

*Compiled by*  
ENGLISH TEACHERS  
*Rockford Senior High School*  
*Rockford, Illinois*  
*Under the Direction of*  
MELLIE JOHN  
*Head of the Department*

*Lively, zestful practice materials*  
in **FUNCTIONAL** *grammar*  
*and composition*

BOOK I \* BOOK II

they induce. Drill and practice exercises are so offered that the student is not conscious that he is being drilled. Word study, punctuation, correspondence, paragraph study, grammar, and sentence study are covered.

This material originated in the authors' classrooms, as the direct fulfillment of pupils' needs, and its effectiveness has been proved by many years' successful use. Book I—\$0.48. Book II—\$0.40.

*In the spirited tempo of modern  
boys' and girls' life and activities*

A welcome divergence from the customary treatment of the course in composition—not in content, but in the sparkling, joyous tempo of its presentation. Teachers and pupils alike rejoice in its conversational tone; in its stimulating subjects for assignments; and in its purposive equipment to lead to a working facility and skill in written and spoken English. \$1.20. Book II, ready soon.

## HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH

BOOK I  
Canby—Opdycke—Gillum

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

New York      Boston      Chicago  
Dallas      Atlanta      San Francisco

*In writing advertisers please mention CLEARING HOUSE*



# THE CLEARING HOUSE

A journal for progressive junior and  
senior high-school people

Vol. VII

JANUARY, 1933

No. 5

## EDITORIAL

### Let's Own Up

Collecting the articles, which the editors of *THE CLEARING HOUSE* submit to you in this "bunk" number, has been an experience of no small educational value. In particular, it has been interesting and enlightening to note the contrast between two widely different kinds of response from two groups given the opportunity to submit articles.

Those whose contributions you are about to read seized with eagerness the opportunity to give expression to their convictions about educational practices to which they are opposed. Others were firm in the belief that current conditions make it inadvisable to call attention to the flaws in our schools; that the support of the public should be maintained by pointing out only the great amount of good that the schools are accomplishing.

Are we to assume that the former group is made up of irresponsible critics who would undermine a great social institution and the latter of valiant defenders of a noble cause? The editors made a different assumption and you are in a position to judge, from the tone of the articles that follow, whether the authors are merely destructive critics or whether they are devoted to the improvement of educational practices and to the promotion of the social, intellectual, spiritual, and economic welfare of American children.

If we wish to retain the whole-souled support of the public whose children attend our schools and who foot the bills, let us admit

that we are aware of our shortcomings, but let us also express and carry out our determination to correct them. This is the spirit in which the "bunk" number of *THE CLEARING HOUSE* was undertaken and it is the opinion of the editors that this spirit is sincerely, vigorously, and courageously manifested throughout the contents.—A. D. W.

### NEXT MONTH

Professor Calvin O. Davis, University of Michigan, in "Trends in Junior-High-School Development," declares that "the junior high school is not dying out, but is meeting with a high degree of success wherever its real purposes have been understood and wherever personal initiative and financial resources have been at hand to carry these into effect. The most conspicuous trend looking to improvement of the junior high school is that which is emphasizing educational experimentation as a basis for all lasting changes."

These articles discussing the whole field are followed by more than a dozen specialized articles discussing the evaluation of the junior high school in terms of health, citizenship, pupil participation, appreciation power, self-directive power, vocational information, etc.

## THE RESEARCH RACKET

PHILIP W. L. COX

EDITOR'S NOTE: *P. W. L. Cox, professor of education at New York University, feels that the research experts are sometimes likely to attach too much significance to the results of their interpretation of such statistical outcomes as the reliability of obtained averages, and that they are too prone to base decisions affecting human lives upon somewhat tenuous mathematical abstractions.*

A. D. W.

IN THE world of trade in gangster-infested cities, the merchant is invited to subscribe to a "protective" association, a regulatory body that assures the shopkeepers or the service dispensers against cutthroat competition and "unfair" tactics on the part of rival groups. For this service he pays to the organization that protects him a part of his profits. Thus his operations are stabilized and, in a sense, scientifically controlled.

In the educational world, financial profit plays no great part. The place of money is largely taken by prestige and self-respect. One's happiness depends on social approval and on his position of "authority." For this status, one struggles; and the means of reaching it are eagerly sought.

Without conscious intention, there has developed during the last quarter of a century, a magical instrument by which "expertness" and "authority" can be gained by young men and women without the necessity of serving long apprenticeships in practical educational work. All one has to do is to accept the magic and mystical arts of research, pay tribute in form of unquestioning admiration and wonder at the marvelous formulae and dull solemnity of the researchers. One's position as a "scholar" is then guaranteed by the research brotherhood of bewildered pedagogues who control magazines, programs of educational meetings, course credits, and thesis standards.

And so there has developed the order of owls of research. He who would be skeptical must have the keen wit of a Bode, the persuasiveness of a Kilpatrick; else, he writes himself down as "unscientific" and an educational outcast!

*The racket is not intentionally or consciously undertaken.* The title of this article is reasonably accurate even though it may be somewhat unfair in its implications. For it may suggest that those who profit so unfairly through "research" and whose influence on education is sometimes so great and so harmful intend to exploit their more or less scholarly and detached activities at the expense of the activists.

No such implication is justifiable. Obviously, there is frequently lacking a sense of humor or of proportion among the researchers. They accept themselves seriously as "experts" and "specialists" regarding the problems on which they conduct investigations, whereas in actuality they are mere technicians of investigation. They have, perhaps, exact knowledges regarding specific aspects of the problems with which their studies are concerned. But unless they actually engage in the execution of educational projects—involving the administrative difficulties, the human adjustments, and the compromises necessitated by tradition and vested interests—they lack the experiences which alone can qualify them as experts.

In the field of the curriculum, for instance, contributions have doubtless been made by word counts, sociological analyses, controlled experiments of learning, studies of pupil population, and surveys of current practices. No one researcher is likely to make studies in all of these fields, however. Indeed, if such a paragon of research should exist, he could scarcely by his own efforts cover the research possibilities in all of the above named aspects of investigations which are potentially important to curriculum making.

## THE RESEARCH RACKET

Nevertheless our self-styled "curriculum specialists" base their pretensions to leadership on their researches in a few aspects of one or more of these fields, despite their cloistered innocence of the practical difficulties involved in actually modifying curriculum practices.

Through the centuries the prophets have protested and ridiculed current inherited practices and laid out concrete proposals for curriculum reform. In the Academy and the House of Delight, at Yverdon, at Kold's School, and at Oundle, in the Francis Parker School, and at Tuskegee Institute, they have dared to adventure to express their faiths. Especially since 1900 has one program of proposals and practices followed another.

Only in the last two decades, however, there have risen to prominence cloistered scientific educationists who have investigated, compared, appraised, and pronounced judgments based on "data" gathered by questionnaires, tests, case studies, and pseudoscientific pooling of prejudices, guesses, and judgments. And the "scientists," who have thus fluttered about and scolded, naively assume that these "researches" qualify them as curriculum experts. As well might a metallurgist claim preëminence as a construction engineer. Truly, those who can, do; those who can't do, may teach; and those who can neither do nor teach become "experts."

The rise of the curriculum research specialist to a position of authority has come about, in large degree, through the confusion that exists regarding the curriculum. If the curriculum were merely the syllabus it might be possible for a student to develop skill in writing outlines or books based on researches. Or if the curriculum were its objectives—things to be learned—such goals might be determined by means of investigations. It should, however, be obvious that the curriculum consists of activities and experiences of boys and girls; such experi-

ences are affected by teacher personalities, by school regimen, by pupil attitudes, and by community standards and tolerances.

Scientists and scientific attitudes and methods have contributed much to educational progress and may be expected to contribute much more. But such further gains from science will be hampered if we do not first of all help researchers to free themselves from their masks of "experts," and with their assistance expand the concept of science until it corresponds to that of Jevons: "... a science teaches us to know, and an art to do; and all the more perfect sciences lead to corresponding useful arts." As scientific educational researchers restrict their assumed expertness to knowledge and recognize their limitations as artists or artisans, they will become more humble. It is easier, of course, to pose as experts in the field of doing by claiming special skill in the field of science than it is to claim expertness in science when we know so very little; and when we are, indeed, uncertain that the little we do know will be true on the morrow. Hence, once their limitations as activists, as administrators, and teachers are faced by researchers, they may be less certain of themselves as "experts." They will be compensated, however, by a new state of mind; they will honor those colleagues who work self-effacingly at their inquiries rather than those who claim, or at least accept homage for, expertness in fields of which they are innocent.

*First of all we should recognize that education itself is not and cannot be a science.* It uses the findings of several sciences and it utilizes technics which are roughly analogous to those of science. True educational research, however, is always directed to the discovery of methods by which conditions may be ameliorated or wiped out. Such a statement does not apply, however, to much so-called educational research which has no other purpose than a respectable "busyness" which leads vapid mentalities towards the

attainment of advanced degrees and jobs in colleges which must have degree-holding professors in order to "maintain standards."

If such silly researches affected no one but the holders of these absurd degrees, little harm would be done. Unfortunately, when they become "professors" they have nothing to profess except formulae for standard deviations and rho's and eta's and the somber dogmas of the research racketeers. Such hot-house "professors" have all the assurance and faith of their essential ignorance. They seldom question the derivation to formulae; almost never do they encourage their students to do so. They blandly determine the probable error of the mean to determine the reliability of the obtained average, blithely innocent of its lack of empirical verification and of the top-heavy superstructure of fantasy built on the "infinite number of cases" myth with meager empirical evidence as justification. Hence, young men and women who seek help in preparing themselves for educational service are denied the bread of life and, instead, are fed up with solemn nonsense about medians, distributions, correlations, and endless factual gravel on which true-false tests may be based.

*The effects of no human institution may be measured objectively.* For governments, families, clubs, schools, and all other social institutions have both formulated and implicit aims which vary in relative importance from day to day and for different persons and groups.

While some aspects of the formulated purposes may be represented by data that can be counted and measured, these aspects are in almost every case unimportant for estimating the accomplishment of the real aims, both formulated and implicit. By such data we can answer how much, how many, what cost, and, perhaps, make tentative estimates for guidance of future policies.

But the significant effects of any social institution on John Jones depends on John

Jones's emotional and behavioristic responses to the institution. What arouses his enthusiasm, hostility, or indifference in one day or one hour may differ widely from its effect on him at another time or under other conditions.

Since our research enthusiasts cannot measure what really matters, they either measure changes in status, skill, or recall, and base conclusions regarding institutions on them; or else they cover up the individual by getting partial and inaccurate pictures of a thousand or ten thousand subjective responses and then treat them mathematically and so arrive at a "truth"!

Such measurements are peculiarly atrocious when applied to institutions that are in an experimental stage of development. Researchers rush in to measure the adequacy of "the" junior high school, "the" project method, or "the" guidance procedure, though they have no experience or knowledge which qualifies them to apperceive the true inwardness, the tentative quality, and spiritual character of such institutions.

It should be evident, therefore, that despite all of the technical hocus-pocus of research there really is no way of correcting data which is not originally reliable and representative. Neither can conclusions drawn from research have a constructive meaning unless the assumptions which underlie the study are valid. These two facts invalidate much, perhaps most, so-called educational research.<sup>1</sup>

*Carefully stated assumptions and tentative hypotheses are of fundamental importance.* In contradiction to the assinine injunction sometimes given out by cloistered research directors, that open-mindedness must not be endangered by any prior opinion regarding probable outcomes, the writer would assert

<sup>1</sup> Note how carefully a true master of research like Courtis states, explains, and protects his assumptions; e.g. Stuart Appleton Courtis, *Why Children Succeed* (Detroit, Mich.: Courtis Standard Tests, 1925), page 30 ff.



## THE RESEARCH RACKET

that the careful examination of assumptions and the development of tentative hypotheses, based on all available knowledge and experience, are of fundamental importance as preliminary steps for most adequate educational research. Any effort to attain the state of blissful ignorance wherein the investigator would have no opinions merely makes hypocrites and self-deceivers out of researchers.

A careful and honest examination of assumptions and hypotheses would invalidate many plans for investigation before researchers wasted the time and energy of themselves, of fellow members, of seminars, and of respondents to questionnaires. Sometimes the assumptions when raised to the level of consciousness are obviously untenable. More often they are so evident that no sane person would ever question them and, therefore, there is no real need for the solemn research procedure.

Thus we now have available the results of some six or eight studies of the curricula and products of junior high schools. In every one of these studies, except that of Glass, an almost random selection of "junior high schools" of a State or of a region were examined—the junior high school being defined as a school in which grades 7, 8, and 9 or grades 7 and 8 were grouped together.

Now every such study has one of two implicit assumptions: (1) that a change of name and a regrouping of grades mystically and automatically assures changes in philosophy, procedures, and measurable outcomes; or (2) that all junior high schools have been established only after careful consideration and acceptance of a revolutionary philosophy of education for youths of 12 to 15 years of age, that they are all adequately administered and taught in accordance with such a philosophy, and that the effects of such changed procedures on children are such that they can be measured by the instruments to be employed by the investigator.

Hypotheses implicitly held by the investigators have grown out of one or the other of these assumptions: (1) that there will be found significant differences in procedures and outcomes as between junior high schools and conventional secondary schools (which alone justifies any tone of surprise); or (2) that despite the changes in philosophy and procedures, the reorganized schools are no better than the old ones.

Since both assumptions are at once seen to be absurd, the hypotheses are invalid and investigation is futile.

*Researchers too often misinterpret the meanings of the cryptic symbols they use.* Next to the failure to state and examine critically the assumptions and hypotheses implicit in the attack on educational problems to be "researched," the most frequent farce which disgraces "educational science" is the misunderstanding of the significance of "correlation coefficients." A coefficient of correlation is said to be significant if it is three times as great as is the probable error.<sup>2</sup> But such significance means merely a probability of correlation. It does not imply that because two factors vary correlatively one is the cause of the other.

Thus height and weight have a significant positive correlation, but making a person weigh more will not of itself increase his height. Nevertheless, a very great number of studies err not only in their assumptions that a high coefficient of correlation indicates that factor one directly affects or causes factor two but also in their conclusions and interpretations. The two studies of student leaders recently published in *School Review*, with interpretations, imply that because high scholarship, high intelligence, and high caliber leadership are highly correlated that the schools are making adequate contribution to

<sup>2</sup> Even relatively high correlations may be due to mere chance relationships. See Stephen M. Corey, "We Need Less Logical and More Empirical Evidence." *School and Society*, xxxiii, 860, June 20, 1931, page 831.



the development of leaders; whereas the antithetical interpretation would be fully as valid—that the school, by selecting only students endowed with high abstract intelligence for positions of student leadership, is utterly neglecting to help the great mass of youths to attain to self-expression.

*Research as high-grade intellectual play.* Nothing in this paper should be understood to be an objection to any person who seeks release in practising with the instruments of investigation in a spirit of high-grade play. There is no reason why a person should not wonder whether participation in athletics is correlated with success in Latin and then proceed to gather data by which to measure each condition and work out a correlation. Such mental play is similar to that found in working crossword puzzles, playing bridge, or solving three-point problems.

It is only when the gamester gets serious and sanctimonious and poses as a scientist that he becomes absurd. In that rôle, he sometimes attempts to give advice or caution regarding eligibility rules or point systems or honor societies. And such is the prestige of the research racket that he occasionally becomes accepted as an "authority" in school administration or in "extracurricular" activities without ever administering anything or participating in student life at all!

*Administrators and teachers have need of scientific attitudes rather than of proficiency in research technics.* Most educational needs are so obvious that only the roughest inquiry is of immediate value. The discovery of pupil groups who are either not enrolled by the school or, if enrolled, are not finding opportunities suited to their abilities and interests, required awareness of maladjustments, and alertness, sympathy, and open-mindedness towards all youths for whom the school is established and maintained. For the rest, the administrator and teacher find their challenge in "doing something about it" so as to decrease the adverse conditions and, if pos-

sible, to overcome them. Among competent educational practitioners thought and facts are pursued for the sake of action; whereas in the research world thought and facts seldom have any purpose beyond themselves.

The stereotype that has grown into wide acceptance that all such shortcomings are challenges for painstaking researchers is absurd. When approximation in conclusions is sufficient for the purposes of application, meticulous refinements of technics are absurd. Sometimes, the elaborateness of investigations by which the obvious is discovered to be true makes one suspect that the administrator is seeking delay and rationalizing his failure by wasting time "studying his problem" when he ought to be making administrative adaptations to overcome the perfectly evident shortcomings in his school organization and procedures. Such school administrators reflect the practices common to political leaders. President Hoover's fact-finding commissions have thus served to assure the public and himself of his interest in social welfare, crime prevention, law enforcement, and the rest, while saving him the trouble of doing very much about any one of them.

A somewhat similar attitude of avoiding reality by plunging into the make-believe of distributions, graphs, and mathematical magic affects students and instructors in schools of education. The respectability of "doing research" encourages educators to sublimate drives for accomplishments into drives for meticulous investigations. In these men and women, "the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Moreover, for the same reasons, research has been draining off from productive educational applications an unjustifiably large proportion of the very capable young men in education. As a result, the real educational job of conducting schools and teaching pupils is too largely in the hands of men and

## THE RESEARCH RACKET

women of intellectual mediocrity; the leavening effect of the entrance into the teaching profession (as opposed to the research profession) of alert and eager young people of high intellectual capacity and curiosity is lacking, and so education is to some degree impoverished.

*The dualism of educational science and educational philosophy is both invalid and very unfortunate.* The affirmative activist in education is concerned in creating school conditions that seem to him desirable. What he needs is an intellectual curiosity and a spiritual drive to reflect on his experiences, to compare his tentative conclusions with those of his fellows, and to reach tentative conclusions that he will straightway try out under critical observations and evaluations leading to further changes in policies and procedures.

Such reflections on one's own experiences are sometimes miscalled a priori reasoning and armchair theorizing in contrast with scientific thinking. Such a distinction is however invalid. Experiences, as such, are themselves just as real as are words, pebbles, or other "things" that can be counted, distributed, and computed.

It follows, therefore, that experiences may be valuable for research purposes even though they are admittedly difficult to interpret. Certainly, it is true that in any problem that involves experiences, as all problems in applied sciences do, no research is adequately consummated until and unless experiences are utilized.

In all such problems, reflective thinking is of far greater importance than is the mathematical treatment of objective data. Adequate reflective thinking depends on experiences and on the insight into subtle ele-

ments in the situations which is born of experiences and adjustments. Such reflective thinking is of utmost importance in the statement of every problem, in the drawing and selection of hypotheses and their elaboration, in the interpretation of results, and in the recommendations of procedures in the light of such interpretations of results. It is obvious, therefore, that the objection to philosophical procedure as having no place in science is absurd.

Scientific temper, attitude, and method are involved in the "projection and control in new experiences, pursued systematically, intentionally and on a scale due to freedom from limitation of habit. It is the sole instrumentality of conscious, as distinct from accidental, progress." If this statement of Dewey's is accepted, a much broader conception of "scientific research" must apply to educational procedures than has been common in the past two decades.

*The "research racket" is doomed.* The United States of the War and of the "golden twenties" has been a paradise for many technologies that have seemed significant during a period of great material expansion when every mechanism carried a presumption of its importance and value. Commerce and industry spent money for elaborate researches and they grew at stupendous rates; hence, research was accepted as an important cause of their growth.

The depression has greatly weakened the sanctions of this myth. A healthy skepticism has succeeded the former faith. In education and in business, the legitimate place of research is secure. But the puffed-up frothy pompousness and ignorant conceit of "experts" with their tables and formulae and graphs are done for.

## DELUSIONS OF GRANDEUR

TRUMAN G. REED

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Truman G. Reed, principal of the Wichita High School East of Wichita, Kansas, presents in the following article a stirring appeal for wider recognition of a vital need. The forces at the disposal of teachers must be applied to establishing in the minds and hearts of high-school pupils attitudes and interests that are essential to the solution of the problems of the present social order.* A. D. W.

LAST summer a graduate student in a seminar in secondary education selected for his problem "The Social Responsibility of the Modern High School." He had come to my office for a conference concerning the organization of the paper, the topics that might be included, the best method of attack, and other matters that were pertinent to the problem. In the course of the conversation we agreed that the topic was not to be interpreted as another phase of extracurricular work. We emphasized the fact that if the school were to accomplish the task presented to it under the thesis "that education is a long-term investment by the State in order to provide for its perpetuation and improvement,"<sup>1</sup> we must greatly enlarge the social viewpoint in education. Under this conception the school is concerned not only with the kind of society that we live in, but also has an even greater concern with a future society. Character education from this point of view is a more inclusive topic than we commonly think it to be, and the character traits that the school must emphasize are those that will definitely contribute towards the improvement of society. This leads, of course, to the conclusion that the faculty of a high school must have pretty clearly in mind the values in life that are to be emphasized and developed both by the curricular and extracurricular offering of the school. We agreed that the school must definitely assume the responsibility of acting as a more dynamic agency in the regeneration of society. After the student had gone a colleague in the university faculty, not a member of the staff in education, voiced an objection.

<sup>1</sup> T. H. Briggs, *The Great Investment* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930), x + 143 pages.

"You are all wrong. The schools have no business deciding what kind of society we shall live in, or what kind of character their pupils will possess. The basic 'sets' of the adult world will determine these, and it is the business of schools and colleges to teach people to think. Teach facts, how to think, and society will take care of itself. As I see it, when the schools of the country attempt to bring about a new kind of society or form the character of the pupils through the methods that you have been outlining, they are suffering from delusions of grandeur. The schools can't do it. Adult society determines these elements."

The pronouncement was made with emphasis and considerable feeling. He was in earnest and convinced of the soundness of his statement. He is a man of genuine scholarship and a first-rate teacher. He compels respect. I began to analyze the statement and reflect on it in terms of the present situation in society. Should the school concern itself with the problems of society? Can it have a direct influence in determining the quality of the social order? Has education justified itself in terms of an improved social order? Are we suffering from delusions of grandeur?

It has been fourteen years since the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education rendered its report on the Cardinal Objectives of secondary education. The statement of the Commission has been accepted whole-heartedly by a majority of educators in the nation and a sincere effort has been made to realize the objectives. The objective of citizenship has been especially emphasized, and has been reinforced by laws in most of the States that require high-school

## DELUSIONS OF GRANDEUR

pupils to spend at least a year in subject matter in social science that the State regards as particularly important and necessary to its security. All over the nation we can say that literally thousands of teachers are busy each day teaching classes in civics, citizenship, politics, history, and social problems. Yet we see our cities, particularly our largest ones, on the threshold of a collapse in municipal government. The high schools in New York have not been idle for a generation; yet we have the revelations of the Seabury investigations. Chicago has a complete system of high schools—yet we face the fact that that city has been controlled by gangsters for the past few years and that today its finances are in such condition that the functioning of its civic institutions is seriously threatened. We can extend this list indefinitely, but we will leave it here for each reader to supply data that is pertinent to his local situation.

How shall we answer these questions? How shall we reply to our critic who said that the school is not concerned with these problems? It will be easy and comfortable for all of us to say that the school hasn't had a chance; that it is only recently since we have had students in sufficient numbers that we could make an impression on society; that when we are through revising our curriculum we will become more effective. We can find a multitude of reasons as to why we are not more effective. But it would be more to the point to find methods and materials that will make the schools what we have so eloquently claimed they were. We have been finding excuses long enough. If we are to retain the respect and confidence of the people who make the school possible, we must begin to show results that are reflected in the social, political, and economic structure of our society.

Probably this should be our point of departure. Modern society is different. It is extremely complex in its organization and structure. Government today is vastly dif-

ferent from what it was a generation ago. We have learned in the last three years that economic forces and elements transcend national frontiers, and that if we are to control them we must understand them. Do we as teachers understand and appreciate the world in which we live? Two years ago the Department of Superintendence met in Detroit, where for nearly three years thousands of people had been unemployed. Detroit typifies our machine civilization, as does no other city in the world. There in the midst of that social laboratory one might expect the educators who attended the meeting to devote their time to a consideration of some of the economic forces that operate in our world. If we were to be instrumental, as we have so often claimed, in becoming the most potent factor in forming a new society we should have seized this opportunity for the exchange of opinion as to how it could be done and to have studied at first hand the problems that Detroit presented. (Incidentally these investigations should have included something other than ways of feeding, clothing, and housing the thousands of unemployed by the methods usually suggested by rugged individualism.) But in four days of strenuous meetings not one attempt was made by any of our leaders to show the relationship of education to industry, economics, and ethics, or fundamental values in a machine age. Has the school come to grips with life? Can it? Is this business of education a thing apart from the rest of life?

Let us consider briefly the conditions that now confront our people. Of first importance is the fact that machines are now doing the work of the world. Technology is more than a term of the engineer—it is a vital factor in society. Our industrial system can produce in unlimited quantities with an increasingly smaller supply of man power. Indeed, so proficient have we become from the producing standpoint that men seriously propose this factor as the cause of the present depres-



sion. We produce too much. Farm boards urge our farmers to plow up every other row of cotton, corn, potatoes, and other crops; and recommend that wheat acreage should be sharply curtailed. Farmers can't pay their bills or their taxes because they have produced too much! Yet in our great centers of population and now spreading to the smaller cities and towns is a growing army of people who are faced with the acute problem of virtual starvation. One section of our population has too much, another too little! Coal is a sick industry. Great areas in our coal-producing section are a nightmare of misery and suffering because miners can't dig coal when there is no market. Yet in other sections families are cold. And so we could go on indefinitely. The oil industry, railroads, iron and steel, light industry, banking, finance, wholesaling, retailing—all are in serious trouble and facing collapse. Yet men talk glibly of prosperity being "just around the corner," and seriously propose that the return of "light wine and beer" will lead us out of our economic wilderness. So-called "hard-boiled business men" have resorted to all manner of cures ranging all the way from frenzied advertising campaigns to plaintive pleas to start all over again. But prosperity, in the sense of a fundamental feeling of security on the part of the masses of our people, an abiding conviction of the soundness of our institutions, still eludes us.

This is the task. What can be done about it? The only reasonable answer is education. Everything else has been tried. Now the school must apply itself resolutely to the job; not to effect an immediate cure but to assure ourselves that such a situation as we have endured and are enduring will not occur again. But it must be an education of a different sort, or in a different direction and intensity from the kind we have had in the past. After all, our training and education has not fitted us to solve the problems of the present situation. We have not sought sys-

tematically to combat the individualism and ruthless competition that have been so characteristic of the period that produced the depression. Our people regarded education as a method of escaping hard work and we did not disillusion them. We taught "patriotism," but not citizenship. We gave credit for courses that were not learned in the sense that they changed the behavior of people and gave them a new insight into social organization and a different outlook upon life. If this is to be changed it must be along the lines suggested by Tugwell when he says: "The rôle of education is twofold: to create a society which is the best possible one by providing the raw material of right opinion making; and to convince individuals of the identity of their interests with those of the group. The merging of these two great aims is certain only when the educational program concentrates on genuine social problems actually needing solution, and when it adopts what educators agree is the best general pedagogical method."<sup>2</sup>

We must concentrate on the raw material of right opinion making and on genuine social problems. We have not done this in the past. We have been content to point out some of our mistakes in history classes, but when it came to focusing on problems that were urgent, even crucial, we too often made the plea of lack of knowledge, insufficient data, tendency to be unscientific, or that we might be taking sides. But in spite of our modesty the forces moved ahead and are now threatening to crush us. Where can pupils learn better to discuss topics of genuine interest and cruciality than in school? Where can light be substituted for heat better than in a classroom under a properly trained teacher? In American politics and economics we tend to generate a great deal of heat and very little light. May this not be due to the fact

<sup>2</sup> R. T. Tugwell, "The Neilson's Roads to Knowledge," *Roads to Knowledge* (New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1932), vi + 349 pages.



## DELUSIONS OF GRANDEUR

that we are not accustomed to carrying on discussions of a highly emotional nature under conditions that are productive of a reasonable conclusion.

Here are some problems that surely are crucial and must have some "right opinion making" produced if they are to be solved. What is an economic system for? This question is simple but the answers to it, both within and without the school, will range all the way from the fundamental implications of "rugged individualism" to communism. As one examines courses of study in economics and social problems, excellent as they are in some instances, the answer to this basic question is not directly considered. Pupils leave the course without a fundamental knowledge of how our economic structure is put together, what makes it run, and, particularly, what it is for. The more obvious factors of production are set forth with considerable detail, but distribution is seldom mentioned. But our problem today is a problem of distribution, not only of commodities but of wealth. Should pupils learn about wealth distribution in our country from a newspaper columnist, a soap-box orator, a partisan politician seeking office, or in school where all of the factors may be studied with a reasonable degree of enlightenment? They will meet this problem sooner or later. We must decide where the best learning goes on. We have found in our high school a gratifying interest and enthusiasm for such information when we had introduced the pupils to some of the books of Stuart Chase—particularly, *A New Deal*. We did not offer this as final authority in the matter; there is no final authority as yet. But our pupils were interested in his presentation and continued their reading and study in other books.

How does government today differ from government in the days when the republic was young? Is government in both instances the same? When our country was founded

the citizens were greatly concerned with safeguarding their liberties, but they did not turn to government for service to the citizen. The social order, at that time, was a comparatively simple one. Cities were few in number, and manufacturing practically nonexistent. The social pattern was clear, simple, and relatively free from conflicting interests. It was possible to elect representatives that could really represent a constituency. Now this is changed. Citizens demand a multitude of services from their Government—local, State, and national, that were undreamed of in the beginning. Mr. Beck may lament the development of bureaucracy, and when unnecessary and inefficient it must be corrected, but it is extremely doubtful if our citizens will be content with government less serviceable than it is today. Bureaus, commissions, special committees, and other developments of modern government have been made necessary by the growing intricacy of our industrial and economic life. These special factors in government must become more efficient and better equipped to discharge their several functions and their offices must not be regarded as rewards for victorious politicians. In terms of this growing complexity of Government with its Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Tariff Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and a multitude of others, it would seem that high-school pupils could examine government from an entirely new point of view—government as service to the citizen. And in this connection taxes would be an entirely different problem. They could also examine with great profit the slogan that was so popular before the stock-market crash (but heard not so frequently in these lean days), "less Government in business."

Another question that must be answered by the generation that is now in high school is this: How does the quality of democratic life and institutions differ today from that

of earlier periods in our history? Can democracy meet the challenges to politics that President Glenn Frank presents so cogently—the challenges of science, of distance, of technology, of party, of the majority, of leadership, and of revolution.<sup>3</sup> If our pupils are confronted with these problems in the high school, while they cannot exhaust or solve them, they can get an understanding of them and the process of right opinion making will be at work. Democracy is different today; events and forces have made it so. There are matters that concern the average citizen very intimately but he has no right to vote on the matter except indirectly. Such topics as finance, tariff, railroads, and public utilities are highly technical and must be handled by competent men. In the modern scheme the expert assumes an increasing importance, and the body of citizens must know when he is to assume his rôle. The old days of complete competence on the part of the voter to pass upon every question are gone, if they ever existed. The point for high-school pupils is that they should be aware of the problem, know the general outlines, and the major facts, manifest an active interest, but know that only competent men should ultimately offer a solution.

The war debts offer another opportunity that should not be overlooked. The press is filled with contradictory views. The ultimate action of both the Congress and the foreign nations is of great importance to our citizens. This problem offers an opportunity not only in economics and finance, but opens up the entire field of international relations which is so important. The old parochial spirit that has brooded over the world for so many generations and has caused so much suffering through misunderstanding and war can only be dispelled by careful and intelligent study of the interdependence of people and the

necessity for the creation of a world consciousness.

These are some of the problems that might be considered in high-school social studies. This list does not pretend to be exhaustive but rather suggestive of material that must be put into the courses if the school is to realize larger dividends in intelligent citizenship upon its investment in free public education. The problems are not to be attacked as a matter of mere current events, but as problems that are of major importance to the welfare of every pupil in the school. They are not academic exercises to be recited for credit. The final solution to these and similar problems will determine the future occupations, incomes, standards of living, and, to a greater extent than we like to assume, they will also determine the individual's opportunity to share in "the good life."

These outcomes are important and the school must concern itself with them, but there is another factor in the problem that is of greater importance because it qualifies and determines the worth of both the process and the results. This is the factor of values of life. They have always been an element in the American high school, but too often they have been regarded as a by-product of the educative process. Now they are of supreme importance and demand clarification and agreement. If we are to regard the school as a means of social regeneration and an agency for the advancement of the commonwealth, we must agree as to those values in life that are important and can be used as objectives in the school.

Can we agree as to values? Probably not in detail or in the first discussion but as we proceed with the analysis of our problems and get a clearer picture of the future possibility in American life we can at least eliminate some of the mistakes of the past. The school has too often condoned the ethics of the market place and permitted pupils to leave school with the attitude that the

<sup>3</sup> Glenn Frank, *Thunder and Dawn* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), xiii + 404 pages.

## DELUSIONS OF GRANDEUR

really important task in life is to get rich. We have aided and abetted the popular confusion contained in the phrase "bigger and better." We have unthinkingly acquiesced in the current sentiment that intelligent and searching criticism is knocking, and that no one must "sell America short." In short we have permitted the folkways and mores to be substituted for real values in life, and our pupils, being realists, have assumed that the important values were not those that were presented in the best of our literature, but those that made for "success."

We must define our values in terms of the society that a machine age is producing and utilize every agency of the school to strengthen them. The frontier has gone, and with it have gone the ethics and values that it produced. The American ideal of a life richer, fuller, and more meaningful for the common citizen must be realized in terms of modern society with its complicated economic structure. It means a wider distribution of wealth, opportunity, and the good things that a machine civilization can produce; it emphasizes coöperative effort and exalts the individual who has made possible the happiness and security of a multitude. "Service above Self" must be something more than a phrase that is piously mouthed once a week. It must become a living reality in the work-a-day world. In a machine economy men must seek satisfactions and rewards not in the piling up of things but in the undeveloped possibilities of collective living and the exaltations of the human spirit. Ultimate values,

then, in a machine age, reside where educators have always claimed they did—in the adventures in intellectual, aesthetic, and spiritual life. The modern trend of life has played directly into the hands of educators and the tremendous forces operative in society today can have meaning and significance only as the school gives the proper guidance and direction.

Are we equal to the opportunity? Do we have the vision, the knowledge, and the consecration to lead our people to the realization of these ideals and a recognition of these values? It is a great responsibility and can only be realized by a group with a common purpose, philosophy, and idealism. It cannot be accomplished by teachers publicized as "ists" or motivated by "isms." There is a growing conviction on the part of alert educators that the business mind, so long dominant in American life and so responsible for the present dilemma, is bankrupt, and that we have no choice in the matter but to assume leadership with all of its responsibility.

We may have suffered from delusions of grandeur in the past and may be suffering now, but we need not be. If we accept the challenge that the existing situation presents, education must become a dynamic power in our country. The program must be so conceived that our pupils will be enabled to leave the school with a clearer vision of the possibilities in American life, an understanding of the fundamental forces operating in life, and above all the will to work and to make the American ideal a reality.

## ON THE SPOT

H. H. RYAN

EDITOR'S NOTE: *H. H. Ryan, principal of the University High School at the University of Wisconsin, in the following article caricatures some of the outstanding types that one meets in various educational connections.* A. D. W.

THE following persons are placed in nomination for extermination:

1. *Principal O. Jawohl.* Mr. Jawohl used to be an exponent of supervised study; he was irritatingly aggressive on the subject at the conventions and at the meetings of the Schoolmasters Club. But now he is writing a thesis under Professor Bombast, who has made the Associated Press in a tirade against supervised study. Principal Jawohl has recently become a bitter crusader against it under the devastating title "snoopervised study"; he questions the intelligence of its proponents and makes good use of the technique of "argument by vituperation." Professor Bombast marks him A in the advanced seminar in research.

2. *Dean Henri D'Orsoscraitch* of the School of Education and *Superintendent Q. T. Diehl* of the metropole public schools. These men are a stimulating example of complete mutual understanding and of harmonious study of the problems of education. Superintendent Diehl teaches in the summer session and Dean D'Orsoscraitch is retained as "Educational Consultant" of the metropole schools.

3. *Major E. T. Melior.* The Major is secretary of the southwestern section of the State Association. Since he took over the office there has been a remarkable increase in the membership of the association, in the amount of material which the association publishes, and in the Major's salary. Those who purchase life memberships or who send word that their teaching corps are 100 per cent members, are listed on a special page of the Journal as "Men and Women Foremost in Education." As the Major so strikingly puts it, "In these troublous times, naught but a united front will carry us through."

4. *Assistant Superintendent A. B. Schleiss.* Mr. Schleiss has just accepted an invitation from a publishing house to be one of two authors of a book on general science which is to appear soon. Mr. Schleiss has never taught science, but the metropolitan school system of which he is a supervisory officer is to adopt science texts next year.

5. *Mr. I. V. Gottit.* During the World War, Mr. Gottit was invited by the Government to see how much money he could spend in the erection of wooden buildings. To encourage him, Uncle Sam promised him a nickel for himself every time he spent a dollar. Those nickels bought a \$357,000 office building which later sold for \$1,832,000. This sum is now safely invested in such a way that Mr. Gottit's four children will presumably never have to soil their hands nor strain their nervous systems in the solution of knotty problems. Mr. Gottit wants to find a school where his children will not be compelled to learn about citizenship, suffering, or hard work. He wants them to learn how to get the most satisfaction from the labors of the wage earners of the world. He is not interested in vocational guidance.

6. *Miss Ann Emic.* Miss Ann's suitor was shot in the back at San Juan Hill. She boasts that in the three years of their courtship there was but one indiscretion—the kiss that she permitted her soldier boy as he entrained for a Southern port. Miss Ann deplores the frankness and the easy attitude which characterize the sexes today. She believes in sex segregation from the kindergarten through the graduate school. She is grieved at the amount of attention given to extracurricular activities; she feels that Fred Oaf (I.Q. 96) will never attain an intelligent familiarity with the several Egyptian dynasties and will



## ON THE SPOT

always be behind on his Beowulf if he thinks about forward passes all day long. She introduced a motion in a recent faculty meeting to permit only "A" students to take part in school plays.

7. *Principal C. B. Hasch and Miss Patty Stande.* Miss Stande and Mr. Hasch are starting a "Back to Fundamentals" movement. Miss Stande has taught the Cicero and Vergil classes since 1905. She has learned, by studying the lives of her former pupils, that sturdy character is most rapidly developed by faithful daily translation of Latin literature. Her routine is very simple. She goes home each afternoon at three and sleeps until supper time; from seven to ten she reads. Her week-ends she spends with her invalid sister in a neighboring town.

Principal Hasch has a half interest in a restaurant at Cloverdale. Times are so bad that he finds it necessary to watch his investment pretty closely. The evening trade, especially, requires constant attention.

Miss Stande and Principal Hasch are agreed that the fads and frills of modern education are a waste of the pupils' time. "The simple school life" is their battle cry.

8. *Mr. Frank Incense.* Mr. Incense wants his pupils to spend the day creating things. As he told the Mothers' Club, "If this world is not as sweet and clean as you wish it, create one that is!" Each day he asks his class, "What shall we create today?" The masterpiece so far is an epitaph beginning "A soul crushed by a sinkful of dirty dishes."

9. *Mr. Freeman Andy Howe.* Mr. Howe teaches English and American literature. His *bête noir* is inhibitions. He wants a law against them. To him the ideal life springs from the free impact of the environment upon the inner urge. That is just the way

some of the fellows feel about it. The incident of the derby hat full of lubricating oil has shaken Mr. Howe's faith a little, but he thinks that the "administrative details" can be arranged.

10. *Mr. Herbart Stuff and Mr. Simon Pure.* Mr. Stuff contends that "learning to teach" means "learning *how* to teach." Subject matter, he says, is soon forgotten by the pupils anyway, so why bother about that?

Mr. Pure believes in "scholarship." He claims that knowledge carries its own learning prescription. (Author's aside—whoever demands an egg that is either all yolk or all white is not interested in having the egg develop into something.)

11. *Mr. Timothy (Spike) Iago.* Spike has served fifteen years on the Board of Education as representative of the mill owners. He has a record as a superintendent baiter. When the superintendent proved hard to manage, Spike got at him by stirring up the classroom teachers against him. He did this with finesse and enthusiasm. All the incompetents in the system came to him with their troubles and gave him the dirt about those who were loyal to the superintendent. When the principals showed a tendency to support the superintendent, Spike grinned and got busy. He charged one with kissing a twelve-year old pupil and another with keeping \$200 of school money in his own bank account. He suggested a rule requiring all employees to live within the city limits to the consternation of those principals who were nursing slender equities in suburban homes.

Mr. Iago is the author of a series of articles on "Promoting Harmony in the Teaching Corps," "Morale Is Worth Dollars and Cents," and "Upholding the Hands of the Superintendent."



## EDUCATION THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

### A Symposium by Ten Senior-High-School Pupils

C. L. CUSHMAN

EDITOR'S NOTE: *What do your pupils think about the subjects they are studying in your classes and about the way you are teaching them?* C. L. Cushman, director of curriculum in the Denver Public Schools, presents the record of a discussion carried on by high-school pupils, which, if one reads it attentively, leads one to think about the possibility of benefiting by pupils' criticism.

A. D. W.

Who has a better right to speak on the subject, What Education Is of Most Worth, than the high-school student? With this thought in mind a conference was arranged between the writer and ten students of a senior high school in Denver. A list of questions pertaining to the subject of the conference was given to each of the students with the explanation that the discussion would deal with these. A secretary took a stenographic record of the discussion. Care has been taken to retain such portions of the discussion as will give a fair picture of the different students' points of view. No attempt has been made to correct speech errors or improve the expression of the pupils.

The writer is convinced that in the main these comments are typical of students' reactions to the institution of secondary education as it exists through the country. Both the constructive tendencies and the shortcomings noted by the pupils as existing within their school could be duplicated in a greater or lesser degree in any large senior high school. The courageous, progressive high school welcomes the help which is to be found in these student reactions.

Do our students plan or merely accept their education? It is this question which the reader will do well to consider as he reads these students' reactions to the work of their school.

*Can you give reasons which justify the time and effort you give to at least one of your subjects?*

ELEANOR: The Foods 3 course is called Home-making and Child Care. It has helped me because it has widened my point of view and knowledge on some subjects. We have a great deal of discussion and we have no tests whatever. I seem to want to

work harder than where I have to prepare for tests. I definitely feel I have learned a number of things.

BOB: In all probability there will be no problem in later life just like working on prisms in solid geometry, but it does make you think how you are going to solve problems in later life. I think the idea is more to teach one how to think than about the different shapes and solids. It makes you use your brain.

MR. CUSHMAN: Bob speaks well of solid geometry because it makes him think. What do you think about that?

HENRY: I can't agree with Bob, although I had a similar experience in Latin. It made me think quite a bit. It gave me the habit of studying every night—the habit of industry. But I found it doesn't last. This year I am taking easier subjects and the result is I am not working so hard.

PAUL: In a lot of courses it is not so much a matter of thinking, but it is a lot of facts to give parrot fashion.

MABEL: Bob, I think perhaps there are other subjects that would be more helpful, that would make you think. Instead of learning facts, we learn things that will really help us. I took geometry and I don't know much about it now. It made me concentrate, but I think there are other things on which one can concentrate.

ELEANOR: I think a course like geometry teaches the primary purpose of thinking. If you try to think in a helter-skelter way, you don't get so far. You have to think a thing clear through.

MR. CUSHMAN: Bob, you started us on this discussion. What difference do you think your course in geometry would make in your arriving at an intelligent opinion on the question of the cancellation of the war debts?

BOB: To be honest, I had not made much connection between the two.

ANNA: I think in geometry you learn to go to the bottom of things to see if they are going to help. In the same way on the debts you would go to the bottom of things before making a decision. You would work more intelligently after having geometry. You would be more accurate.

## EDUCATION THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

HENRY: No! I agree with Bob that I make no connection between the two. One teacher has said unless you are going to be an engineer, you won't need geometry. The point was that this would make you tackle other problems well, but I couldn't find that it applied. Take another problem. The other day I had to decide whether or not to sell my dog. Geometry didn't help me at all in deciding this. I went to my history teacher and she pointed out that I should line up the benefits I would receive if I sold my dog or kept him.

MR. CUSHMAN: Does the fact that you have had geometry have a bearing on the method of solving such problems?

JACK: I do tackle problems differently since I have had geometry, because geometry is the same as any other problem of life.

RUTH: I have never taken geometry so I can't talk about that, but I have had the algebra before that. I don't see that it has made anything any easier or had anything to do with how I do my other work. I cannot see it.

HENRY: Methods of learning are not transferable. You have to learn to think in history. If you wanted to decide whether Germany should have been punished severely after the World War or should have been dealt with liberally, you would find advantages and disadvantages on both sides. Both seem logical enough. To decide, you would have to know that history repeats itself. You could then go back to our Civil War and see how the North treated the South. From that you can surmise what the decision would be.

*In how much of your school work do you feel you are working for yourself? And, in how much do you feel that you are working primarily for the teacher?*

JACK: I feel that in three subjects I am working for myself, because they are subjects which are due to help me in later life—Spanish, salesmanship, and American problems. I am helping myself by taking them. No one of these subjects is required. I feel that people should know the things these subjects teach. Chemistry is my fourth subject. Here I would say that up to now I have been studying for myself, but we are now entering the work in qualitative analysis and I cannot see that this will help me.

MR. CUSHMAN: How will studying Spanish help you?

JACK: In my opinion South America is a coming nation. It is coming to the front—progressing. Within the next few years it will be foremost. I feel I have always wanted to go down there and

get into some kind of work. Although Portuguese is spoken there, Spanish is the subject to learn. I feel I should go there while young, and this language will help me if I get to go.

ANNA: I have three subjects that are very definitely working together. I am especially interested in home economics. Besides that I am taking psychology and chemistry. Psychology has much to do with how you are going to deal with people. Chemistry is showing me how foods are combined and how much in the things around us we should take notice of. My other subjects are physics and advanced composition. Composition is always good, but I feel I am working more for the teacher in composition.

RUTH: In only one subject do I feel I am working for the teacher. It is a required subject—history, so I must take it. In the others I am working towards my life work. I am planning to be a nurse.

BOB: I also think history is very essential because the people at the administration building have very carefully planned this whole work and the choice of studies. They have taken it from every angle and have required two years of history in high school. If it is required, I should think from all the points they have taken up, they must know what they are talking about.

MR. CUSHMAN: If you were going to make a suggestion for a change in the history course to make it more practical, what suggestion would you give?

HENRY: I would show how it connects up with modern-day problems. I started my work under one teacher who went through the work very rapidly, studying each period as that period alone. Later I went to another teacher who was slower, so I got some of the same work. He always would be tying up things of today, teaching current and past history together, taking the two subjects right along. For example, he showed how Roosevelt will be faced with the same problems that faced Cleveland concerning the tariff.

ELEANOR: I think it would be a good idea to omit some of the ancient history—World History I. I think conditions are so much different from those in ancient times.

PAUL: I disagree with Eleanor. You cannot understand the present unless you understand the past.

RUTH: I am not entirely against history, but ancient history is more interesting than American; for example, the study of the pyramids. It is fun to go back and see why they were done that way. Outline work could be omitted in American history. I prefer oral questions instead of tests.

*In your opinion how much stress should be placed in high school on telling students that they will need certain courses or work to enter college?*

PAUL: The public schools are supposed to be run for all the people. A very small percentage of the students can go to college, so I think schools should be for the larger number instead of the smaller. It seems to me the elementary and junior high schools are all preparing for senior high school, and senior high school is preparing you for college. In college you are preparing for something; always seeking a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

BOB: Paul, I think there isn't quite enough stress on it. A friend of mine intends to enter medical school, but he hasn't paid much attention to the courses he has taken. The other day he told me about two courses he has taken that would not give college credit. These were home economics and commercial writing.

HENRY: I think there are two points of view. There is the ideal side and the practical. The ideal, of course, is that you don't consider any college—work for the good you can get out of it. The practical side—a very close relative of mine went to college and they had the requirement of Latin. He had taken other foreign languages, but just because he had not taken Latin he couldn't get credit. He didn't get his degree and the degree stands in his way of getting a job.

JACK: I, too, think you might get more out of high school if you forgot all about college. Take high-school work for its own face value, but that can hardly be done. You might wake up some day and find you cannot get into college because you lack some credits.

*What part does the textbook you use and the way you use it have in determining whether or not a subject makes a difference in your life?*

JACK: I do not care for one textbook. If you can use the library and consult three or four books, you get different points of view and then form your own opinion from all these ideas.

PAUL: There are mistakes in textbooks. It would be better if they would not present a lot of rules, but rather present a lot of examples instead. For instance, chemistry or physics. You have to accept the rules as the truth, but if they would give examples and allow us to figure out the rule for ourselves, it would give us a better idea.

MARGERY: I think I agree with Jack. Our point of view would be broadened if we had a chance to reach various textbooks instead of one. From

one textbook you will take the author's opinion and you are not so apt to form your own opinion.

CHARLES: Textbooks are helpful, but we depend on them too much. I took a two weeks' course in music before school started. There was no textbook; everything was told to me very clearly. I had to use that information immediately, and by putting it into practice, I have it now. I have retained it.

*What change would you recommend in a high-school program in order that your education might make a greater difference in you?*

MARGERY: I am in favor of doing away with grading. It brings in more or less an opinion of superiority. Some think if they are given an A or B, they are better than the person who is given a C or a D. Sometimes the C or D pupil has worked just as hard. I think it would be much better if grades were given as *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory*.

JACK: No! I think grades are a good thing. The idea of superiority is wrong. Suppose two fellows are good friends and one gets an A and the other a C. The one with the C works harder to become the equal of the A student.

ELEANOR: We have talked about this in a number of classes, and a number of points of view have been brought up. One was that the majority of students just worked to pass.

RUTH: Yes! There are too many pupils in high school that are going to skim—not be interested enough. There is nothing I like better than to get a good grade.

MABEL: I think if we had grades of *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory* we would work more to get out of it what we could.

HENRY: Taking up another point, this education is thrown at you; it does not connect up with life outside of school. But I think the high school should teach you to use your leisure time and how to live. That is the big difference between the American and English people. The English are interested in art and other things, but the American has to be on the go all the time and get entertainment by proxy.

CHARLES: I think physical education has failed. It has not given the average student a strong body to go out and play with the other fellows. It stresses those people who play football. You are given a ball and are told to go out and play ball. There isn't much chance when the light fellows play against the heaviest fellows on the team. They give no definite ways of building up strength.

HENRY: In physical education it seems to me the

## EDUCATION THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

things we learn in high school are the things that are only valuable while in high school or college. Football is absolutely too strenuous to participate in after college. They are not preparing you to live. I think the high school should try to develop some subjects which you carry through life. There are other things in the physical-education line which can be developed. I would like to learn to hunt and to hike.

MABEL: I think instead of having us go out and play, we should be given certain specific things, such as tennis or golf.

BOB: I don't want to defend physical education entirely, but it is supposed to be a form of mental recreation during the day when you can let down. They let us out of doors on nice days.

PAUL: There is another change I think could be made in high school. We are asked to do too much work outside of school. I think the day could be arranged so more could be done in the class period.

MARGERY: I also believe we are given too much outside work to do. I do not have any leisure time after school. I spend most of my time in preparing to study or in studying.

ELEANOR: I think they should change the classes so that you have more discussion groups than we do now.

CHARLES: I think you should be taught to memorize.

JACK: I don't think you should memorize, but you should be taught to understand instead of memorizing like a parrot.

HENRY: To change the policy of this Government, I think the schools should train people or give them a very good knowledge of government so that they can make this Government what it should be. The school is doing only a fair job of this now.

MR. CUSHMAN: Does the work in American problems do that for you?

HENRY: It depends upon the teacher. If interested, he will do that, but I do not believe the average teacher does it. When a teacher has five large classes a day, it is pretty hard to be interested all of the time.

PAUL: I do not think the teachers are doing a

good enough job of making citizens, but I do not know how they could do any better.

JACK: We do not have a chance to understand a thing fully before a period is up, and then have to go and start in on something else. It takes time to get to studying and just when you get concentrated on a subject, the period is up.

This student conversation in no sense touches on all of the major problems of secondary education. It does, however, raise a number of questions of real significance:

1. Are we as honest and as intelligent as we should be in giving students reasons for their school work?

2. To what extent do we ask or permit students merely to accept without question the reasons we give for various subjects?<sup>1</sup>

3. Should we encourage students to comment upon and even criticize the work of our classrooms?

4. Is our work planned too much in terms of students who wish to get out of work, rather than in terms of students who wish to benefit by work?

5. Are we making good in our training for citizenship?

6. Is the pupils' request for recreational training of such a nature as will last throughout the years reasonable?

The writer believes that there is evidence in the remarks of the pupils that we are making progress in dealing with the problems raised by a majority of these questions. Certainly, however, there is a great unfinished task to challenge us on.

<sup>1</sup> A courageous teacher recently told the writer that he was fully conscious of the fact that for several years he had been guilty of giving students as reasons for taking his subject points which he himself knew to be false and inadequate.



## CONCERNING THE IDEA THAT HEALTH CAN BE TAUGHT

JAY B. NASH

EDITOR'S NOTE: Jay B. Nash, professor of education in New York University and head of the department of physical education, feels very keenly that health cannot be taught, because it is dependent upon too many conditions that are beyond the control of the teacher.

A. D. W.

ONE of my pet grievances in connection with the present conduct of junior and senior high schools is in regard to the prevalent idea, and more or less prevalent practice, that *health can be taught* under the ordinary type of classroom procedures or any other way. Particularly do I object to the tendency to make the child conscious of his health. While undoubtedly there are certain things that can be taught about health—certain fundamental things which the child ought to know—it is doubtful whether any procedure which has to do with making posters, hanging mottoes on the wall, or even learning a series of health rules has any effect in accomplishing health objectives. I particularly resent the taking over of May Day, a day of dance, song, and merriment and making of it a health day. I have no objections to taking a day a year for a special investigation as to the conduct of the cafeteria, the condition of dust in school-rooms and yards, the presence or absence of hot water and towels in the washrooms, and the study of adverse attitudes which are being formed in various classrooms, but if such a day is set aside it should not be May Day and should not be a day to make the child health conscious. This constant search for health may turn out to be one of the most unhealthy pursuits of life.

Health is a natural outcome of a way of living. This will be conditioned by certain hereditary, pathological, and psychological factors. The way to achieve the outcomes of this wholesome living is to control these basic factors. It is not merely something about which to talk. On the side of heredity the child has certain health possibilities, depending on how his organism is balanced and

integrated. Some of these factors which tend towards disintegration may be basic, such as cardiac or glandular disorders. Here we have a weakness of the organism which must be dealt with throughout life.

We have certain other pathological factors which we do not thoroughly understand. Some human organisms are immune to certain infections, others are not. Some organisms have a certain degree of immunity to some infections and all organisms seem to lack wholly immunity in other infections. These are body conditions which the leader—teacher, parent, and physician—should know about, but which should not constantly be spread before the child. Streptococcic infection is present in all individuals. It is spread very liberally in subway and theater crowds. There are certain conditions of the human organism which play into the hands of this infection, in which case the body is overcome by hostile troops. This hereditary situation, together with the building up of immunity, may be thought of in terms of a castle wall. There are always certain places weaker than others. There are small numbers of enemies within and large numbers without always willing to coöperate in the conquest. Anything that tends to break down this body protective wall merely invites the enemy without to pour in in large numbers. Breaks in this wall may be thought of in terms of lowered resistance brought about by extreme fatigue, exhaustion, subjecting the body to sudden changes of temperature, such as lying on the damp ground, sitting in a draft, or overcharging the system with alcohol. Focal infections, such as diseased tonsils and diseased teeth, are merely the battleground for these antibodies which con-



## HEALTH CANNOT BE TAUGHT

stitute the army of immunity fighting the invading forces. Sometimes this very immunity, because of the strength of the antibodies in putting up a fight, causes such a disturbance as to kill the body. This happens in the case of a very high temperature maintained over a long period of time. At other times where there is little immunity these invading forces merely paralyze the neural centers of vital function. In this connection there are certain things to be talked about. Children should realize the dangers of sneezing and coughing in crowds, the use of common towels and drinking cups, the dangers of weakening the body protective wall. While some of these may be talked about, as far as the school is concerned, they should be controlled by administrative measures. These rules and regulations, which may be thought of in terms of accidents, communicative and degenerative disorders, should be made available to the child, possibly as a part of his course in general science, with a certain emphasis on personal hygiene in the department of physical education. All these facts could probably be imparted in a course one hour a week over a period of a year. Certainly this course should come early in the junior-high-school curriculum, so that these facts may be in the hands of every one, even though all do not go to college or even finish high school. At the present time these facts are being taught over and over again. They are being taught in the seventh and eighth grades, repeated in the junior high school, repeated again in the high school, and still we have those who think they should be repeated in college. There simply are not enough facts to teach for such a long period. If the child does not appreciate the importance of these rules in the first year in junior high school, he will probably not appreciate the importance of them in the second or third or in senior high school and college.

There are certain psychological factors,

such as worry, fear, and hate, which also weaken this protective wall. The wall is weakened in two different ways. In the presence of these strains the very chemicals which digest food are not properly secreted and hence the body is not nourished and food material is not absorbed into the blood so that it may be utilized in the cells. This in turn lowers resistance of the human organism, which cycle can keep on until it will simply be swept off by the invading host.

All of these things are conditions which should be constantly in the mind of the administrator, but not daily reiterated to the child, as this overconsciousness about health actually becomes one of the strains which undermines health.

On the positive side of health, power to resist fatigue and power to sustain effort are built through a vigorous big-muscle activity training program. To a large extent this base is laid down before the end of adolescence, possibly before adolescence. The body builds power to resist fatigue and possibly to a certain extent to resist streptococcal infection. But the child should not be encouraged to go into a vigorous activity training program because of this outcome. He should go into it for the pure joy of doing. The health by-product should be unconscious—conscious in the mind of the leader, of course, but not in the mind of the child. One of our best psychiatrists was asked by a certain man, "What are the best exercises for health?" The psychiatrist answered, "You don't want exercise, you want joy." So as we joyously pursue some driving interest, health shall be added unto.

Any well-balanced program of physical education, which should have as one of its objects power building, should never be thought of merely in terms of exercise. Life is a balance between exercise—the power building activity, and the rest side—the recuperative side of the formula. It might be well to think of a program of physical

education which has as one of its objectives the building of organic power, which is the basis of health, in terms of a stroke-glide formula. Stroke is the delivery of effort; glide is recuperation. Over a period of twenty-four hours the sleep period is the glide, and the waking period, to a large extent, stroke; this is not entirely true, because each waking moment must conform to a glide-stroke formula. The reason one can walk over a longer period of time than he is able to run is due entirely to the fact that in walking the organism gets more glide. The muscles of the right leg have glide, while the other leg has stroke. This is particularly true in skating and swimming as well. Increase this stroke to one's capacity and the organism cannot sustain effort for more than ten to fifteen seconds, which is the time for running the hundred-yard dash.

The child should have some information as to what happens when a muscle contracts—in other words when it takes stroke—and what happens when it is relaxed or takes glide. Much of the hurry and stress which cuts down the glide side of this formula comes from administrative pressure, such as hurrying between classes, rushing to the shower, hurrying to dress, running to the next class, in other words, keeping the organism under tension. It is interesting to note that a contracted muscle is forming acid by-products even when it is not delivering power. Thus, tenseness in the classroom, although the child is seated, should be thought of in terms of stroke. Relaxation will come about largely through total school and community reorganization, rather than merely teaching facts about it.

Thus we shall say that health becomes this by-product of a joyous, balanced living program. It becomes a by-product in the light of hereditary possibilities, in the absence of

strains and drains which tend to disintegration. All of these depend upon administrative procedures. As the child grows older, of course, he should have some facts relative to his own personal habits; but even here these habits will be motivated by pointing out to the child certain ways in which he can utilize health in following some supreme personal enthusiasm, rather than because of the health itself. In this connection the school should help to provide an environment which conforms to the laws of modern sanitation and which teems with happiness. The gymnasium and the school-room should not be morgues where the "I speak, you jump" type of discipline is in force. The classrooms, and especially the gymnasium and the play yards, should be joy laboratories. Children should not be sent home from school with briefcases filled with books for home study. There is a distinction between homework assigned by the school and work that can be done at home because of the flowing over of the child's interest. Classrooms should not be places where teachers force certain procedures by fear methods and maintain their leadership by scathing sarcasm. All of these are important elements in attaining the outcomes of health and they are largely administrative procedures for which the total school and community are responsible. They are procedures which will yield meager results if we attempt to teach health in the ordinary sense that we use the word teach. Wholesome living is largely a product of good administration in home, school, and community. Health is a by-product of wholesome living. You can teach some things about it, but as a subject it cannot be taught. It must be maintained through the integration of all the factors of the life of the individual.

## THE LONG VACATION IS THE "BUNK"

N. E. BUSTER

EDITOR'S NOTE: *N. E. Buster, principal of the William James Junior High School at Fort Worth, Texas, presents the case for the all-year school. Does any one wish to present the other side?*  
A. D. W.

### HISTORY AND STATISTICS

THE idea of conducting the public schools on a twelve-month schedule is not new. The plan has been in use in Newark, New Jersey, since 1912; in Nashville, Tennessee, since 1923; and, in Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, since 1928. Almost all colleges have been in operation throughout the year within the past thirty years. Most public-school systems in cities conduct public or semipublic summer schools, thus making the school session practically continuous for a few buildings.

We estimate that the public-school buildings of the United States represent an investment of about five billion dollars. These plants are in actual use for six hours per day for about one hundred eighty days each year. (Many schools are in session for a shorter period.) This means that the five-billion-dollar investment is in actual operation for forty-five days of twenty-four hours each during the year. What commercial or industrial enterprise of this magnitude would be permitted to remain idle for seven-eighths of the time? We do not advocate a twenty-four hour daily schedule for public schools, but we would submit some arguments in favor of the economy of greater utility.

The idea of making all school vacations contiguous was probably born of necessity in an earlier day when the population of our country was predominantly rural and all the children were needed at home to assist with the harvest of crops. Now our population is essentially urban and this necessity no longer exists. Certainly it is not essential to set aside three or four months annually for students or teachers to rest and recuperate. The practice is due merely to the inertia of tradition.

### TWO PLANS

Two plans of conducting all-year schools have been used. One organization divides the year into three sessions of seventeen weeks each. Approximately two thirds of the students are in attendance during each term while the remaining one third is on vacation or otherwise employed. The work of one half of a school grade is covered in each session of seventeen weeks. The four-term plan separates the school year into four sessions of twelve weeks each. The work of one school grade is accomplished in three sessions or thirty-six weeks. About three fourths of the students attend school each session.

Both the three-semester plan and the four-session organization provide that all normal students shall remain away from school for one semester during each year. Certain adjustments could be made for overage and irregular students, as individuals, to permit them to attend an extra semester when circumstances demanded.

### SALARIES

A large majority of the teachers who had met all scholastic requirements would serve throughout the year and would receive salaries for the additional time employed. The personnel of the teaching force could be diminished gradually through natural channels. Some teachers would be granted leaves of absence for one or more semesters, at their convenience, to attend universities, to secure additional degrees, to travel, or to recuperate, as their need developed. Some of these teachers would be off duty in the summer and others would choose winter, spring, or fall. No additional money would be nec-

essary to pay these teachers, simply a redistribution of the same salary budget to fewer individuals. Probably there are some teachers who do not care to work for a longer period than nine months. These individuals could be accommodated gracefully without disrupting the operation of the entire system.

#### ECONOMY

Not more than three fourths of the students would attend any one session; therefore, not more than three fourths of the classrooms now in use would require heat. A saving of one fourth of the fuel bill without affecting the comfort of the students would be welcomed by the overburdened taxpayer. A small part of this saving might be used to operate a cooling system in midsummer. In many instances the heating equipment could be utilized as a cooling system by making slight changes. This need not be considered an insurmountable obstacle, because the school building is usually the most comfortable building in the community at any season of the year regardless of the weather. Extreme temperatures and changes in temperature affect children much less than they inconvenience adults at any time, so this objection might be considered negligible.

If three fourths of the students now on our school rolls attended each session, we would equip only three fourths as many classrooms, laboratories, and auditoriums. This saving might find a ready use and satisfy a crying need by providing better furniture, better laboratories, and increased facilities in the gymnasium, playground, libraries, and elaboration in the field of the aesthetic.

The greatest saving, so far as the taxpayer is concerned, would accrue from the decreased number of bond issues for buildings. The long-suffering taxpayer has been very generous in regard to the program of expansion in education. It was to his interest to pay the bill, because, in a democracy

where everybody rules, everybody must be educated; but, during the past few years he has been forced to a policy of retrenchment in the conduct of his own business. He is casting a very critical eye towards the mounting cost of education. We cannot do less than redouble our effort in making an introspective survey looking towards the elimination of waste and the increasing of efficiency in our business of education. We must guarantee the taxpayer that he will get value received for every dollar provided for education. A very definite part of education is to be found in the economical operation of the plan of education.

#### HEALTH

Let us turn from economics to a consideration of other values pertinent to all-year schools.

The health of children and teachers is better during the summer months than at any other time of the year. They get more fresh air, more outdoor exercise, and more sunshine than during any other season. The contagious diseases of childhood—measles, whooping cough, diphtheria, chicken pox, and small pox are all winter diseases. This is not due to the congestion of children in school. If it were, then these diseases would appear in the fall and spring. This seasonal good health is not superinduced by the advent of vacation. Observation reveals that summer-school students and teachers are quite as healthy as their comrades on vacation. At least we have never heard of a summer school being closed due to an epidemic. From the standpoint of health, students and teachers do better work in summer than during the seasons when school is in regular session.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENT

Records show that the percentage of promotion in summer school is higher than the ratio of passing students for the regular session. It is true that most students who at-



## THE LONG VACATION IS THE "BUNK"

tend summer school pay tuition and thus are motivated to exert a greater effort; but we might balance that supposition against the fact that the majority of children who attend summer schools do so to make up work which they lacked ability to do in regular session. The native ability of summer-school children should receive attention as a governing factor.

### RETARDATION

If the school should be divided into four sessions, then students would be expected to cover the work of one grade in three sessions. In case of failure, a smaller unit of work would be repeated, thus tending to eliminate repeaters. The cost of reteaching a student is quite as much as the initial effort; therefore the cost of education would be reduced under the all-year plan by eliminating a part of the repetition.

### CONTINUITY

Under the present plan several days must be spent at the beginning of each school year in perfecting a new organization. Continuous operation of the schools would mean more contented, more confident, more efficient teachers. No commercial or industrial enterprise could long survive a complete disruption of its organization once each year and our schools cannot continue this wasteful procedure without suffering. Under the all-year plan faculties are kept intact, or nearly so, at all times.

### MEN IN THE PROFESSION

The teaching profession needs more men—good men—alert, energetic, enthusiastic, ambitious men; yet, the long unpaid vacation tends to eliminate the cream of the crop. Men are usually accorded the privilege of providing for a family and grocery bills have a way of accumulating during vacation just as they do when the salary check is coming in. Many of our most brilliant teachers, both men and women, have forsaken the profes-

sion because they can provide for their dependents more completely under continuous employment.

### VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

Under the present system we encourage all our boys to remain in school during the time when most boy jobs might be had, then, all at once we release upon the labor market all of our juvenile job hunters during the dull season for business. These boys scurry about seeking the few available positions. At most, only a small number of those who really need employment are accommodated.

Under the all-year plan one fourth or one third of these boys would be available for employment during each school semester. This plan would be more convenient for both employer and employee.

We educators make a great many long-winded speeches about the dignity of labor, we incorporate try-out courses in our curricula, we talk much of vocational guidance, and we render ardent lip service to the idea of "Learning to do by doing," but what experience in these categories could we give our boys that would be more helpful than the opportunity to adapt academic learning to business, professional, or industrial experience on the job? We could permit him to choose and help him to choose some real try-out courses outside the school.

### IDLENESS AND CRIME

The school, under any plan, has an increasing responsibility in the matter of teaching boys and girls in the wise use of leisure time. We make our greatest contribution or we do our worst for society when we are off the job. The all-year school plan will better serve this need because fewer boys and girls are released each semester to fill the available positions and consequently a larger percentage will be occupied in purposeful activities.

#### HOME CONDITIONS

A great many homes constantly need the services of one child to help with the household duties, to care for the sick, to contribute to the family income, or to assist in the care of smaller children. If there are three or four children of school age in the same family alternate children might be kept out of school while the others attend their scholastic duties. The responsibilities of the home are a very definite part of education.

#### CREDITS

No change would be necessary in assigning credit for work done under the all-year plan; each individual student spends the same amount of time in school as is his present custom.

#### DIFFICULTIES

The all-year plan could not be used economically in a small school system. Students transferring from a community using the all-year plan to a system operated under the present régime might experience some difficulty in classification, but the number of these would be negligible.

#### ADULT VACATIONS

Parents take their vacations in the summer for three reasons; viz., because of tradition, because business is dull at that season, or because the children are on vacation. There is little experimental evidence to cite in this connection, as parents have been per-

mitted to choose in few instances; but in cities using the all-year school plan, the school enrollment for one session is about equal to that of any other. The matter adjusts itself. The few cases that require individual attention are easily and satisfactorily worked out in a very short time.

#### TENURE

The perplexing problems of permanent tenure for teachers can be made easier of solution by the adoption of the all-year school plan. Better teachers will be attracted to the profession by a guarantee of permanent, secure, regular annual incomes. The pinch of poverty will be removed. The apprehension incident to disturbing thoughts of long vacations without pay will be inoperative.

Students will remain in school for greater advancement when they realize that education is a continuous process rather than a saltatory series of grades, each of which is a complete unit to be finished and after which there is a long period when the school plant is closed before a new unit is attempted.

This discussion on the subject of all-year schools is submitted for the purpose of provoking your thought and stimulating your reflection rather than an attempt to reform anybody or anything. Turn this over in your mind. The practice in thinking will be beneficial, at any rate.

## THE BUNK OF THE PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE

T. L. SCHOLTZ

EDITOR'S NOTE: *T. L. Scholtz, professor of education at the University of Southern California, writes convincingly on the thesis that education is bound to be largely futile until educators begin to challenge the underlying contradictions in our society instead of sporadically attacking particular misconceptions.*  
A. D. W.

IT IS A favorite belief of schools and colleges of education that they inspire or instill in their graduates a proper "professional" spirit or attitude. Since such an attitude implies the existence of a body of common ideals and objectives, it should be possible to state a little more specifically what these are. On analysis and reflection they appear to be reducible to two: an allegiance purely formal, to something that is supposed to be the philosophy of John Dewey, and a conviction that teachers should have higher salaries. Now these are both excellent things and it is not the intention of this writer to try to controvert them, but it seems appropriate to suggest that they embody a somewhat too limited view of our professional responsibilities.

In the first place, despite our present concern with procedures, techniques, details of psychology, and administration, and the rest, it remains true that teachers teach subjects as well as children, they are responsible for a content as well as a method, and the most efficiently organized school in the world has no justification for its existence unless that organization contributes finally to the learner's mastery and control over his world. The responsibility for this contribution our teacher training has somehow managed to ignore or pass on. It is idle to debate the old question of the division of labor between the schools of education and the colleges of arts and science. It does not matter at the moment who is to blame, if, indeed, anybody is. But the fact remains that our teachers have nothing to teach.

All these carefully trained experts in techniques and procedures—these specialists in Roman history, Elizabethan lyrics,

and the digestive system of the star fish, these graduates of courses in methods in activity schools, the growth and development of the child, the history of secondary schools, and the philosophy of education—few of them can tell a child much of anything about his world and how to deal with it because most of them do not know anything about it. They do not deal with their world; they merely accept it, accommodate themselves to it, with as little thought as the veriest savage about how it might be made a better place for human living. They are victimized by the superstitions of the professional and protected classes generally and they accept the institutional arrangements, which is to say, the bunk, around them with complete docility if not with complete conviction.

They believe that advertising benefits the consumer, that political abuses can be remedied by making individual men more "moral," that it makes a difference which of two or three amiable and ineffective citizens is elected president of the United States or mayor of their city, that the most publicized physicist in the country is therefore an expert on religion or social problems. They believe, from the newest kindergarten teacher to the most magniloquent college president, that the public schools are the bulwark of democracy, that Americans are "free" whereas the citizens of other nations are not, that the object of schooling is to produce an "open-minded" person; that is, one who does not know or believe anything in particular. But the list is endless and too depressing and nothing is to be gained by going on with it. The important question is what to do about it.

The favorite solution has long been to

blame individuals; to charge, as Mr. Mencken, for example, used to be so fond of doing, that teachers are stupid and unambitious intellectually (which is obviously not true), or that administrators are willfully blind and bound by tradition and prejudice (which, even if it were true, is merely a statement of the difficulty and not an answer) or that our universities and teachers' colleges are in various ways defective (which probably is true, but again is certainly not the answer), and so on and on. The whole business bears a striking resemblance, as a respected preceptor of the writer's used to remark, to a kitten chasing its tail, a great deal of activity and no progress. Indeed, the very "theme song," if the vernacular will be pardoned, of this issue of *THE CLEARING HOUSE* is a case in point. It is to be devoted, apparently, to debunking education, as if education were not an integral part of our social and economic system and as if it could be debunked without inquiring where bunk comes from in the first place and why it is there and, incidentally, who profits by it.

For the word unmistakably conveys the implication not only of error but of more or less deliberate falsity, of deception. We fool ourselves or others or, usually, both. How do we come to do it? Why should an educational journal need to devote an issue to attacking such behavior? An aptitude for bunk does not inhere in any special classes or occupations in the population; it is not exclusive with politicians and astrologers and newspaper editors, and teachers are not more prone to it than grocers or icemen or petroleum engineers. Indeed, of knowledge in the sense of possession of information the teaching groups must have rather more than the average of our citizens. Why does not that knowledge protect them better? Well, the fact is that information, as we have always halfway suspected is only the beginning of a defense against bunk; the end lies

in the meaning of the facts known, the understanding, in Dewey's phrase, of what the known demands of us. We are back, in other words, at an old, old story, the demand for an integrated point of view.

But that demand, too, is only a beginning. It is necessary to ask, "Integrated how? Around what center?" To that question also there are old, old answers. All manner of rubber stamps have been put forward as centers for an educational philosophy. We have proposed to base it on philosophical or moral values, on social consciousness or democracy, on vocational guidance, on the nature of the child, on the psychology of learning (meaning the behavior of rats in a maze), and on plenty more of the same sort of things. It begins to appear now that the time has come to say plainly that none of these will do. They are all partial, subordinate to an underlying issue which we have not been able or willing to face. Hence they are, taken as they stand, foundations for the very structures of bunk against which we declaim, for they all carry forward, consciously or unconsciously the assumption that the good society and the good life for the individual can be arrived at piecemeal by pulling and patching at its more or less superficial and incidental aspects. They all embody the pretense that it is possible to teach people how to live *well* without first facing the question how they are to live at all.

For a long time we have pretended that an individual who raised the question of the basic nature and control of our system of production and distribution was at worst a traitor and at best slightly mad. If we have not now learned that the greatest madness lies in not raising that question, then we shall have only ourselves to thank if we must undergo a succession of ever more bitter lessons till we find it out. Bunk in education is derived from the same sources as bunk anywhere else; namely, from an insufficient understanding of what the known de-



## THE BUNK OF THE PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE

mands of us, and it leads at last always to the same result; namely, the advantage of the controlling class at the expense of the rest. We have an educational system which cannot be said to have been designed at all. It formally lays claim, of course, to various official purposes and goals, but it embodies in fact just that tissue of inherent contradictions that constitutes our society as a whole. If we suffer from bunk in education it is a reflection of the same things which our society at large suffers from, and attempts to remedy the situation by sporadic attacks on particular misconceptions that must be fruitless so long as the underlying contradictions in that society remain unchallenged.

The statement may not be welcomed, but the fact remains that the destruction or correction of this particular psychological theory or that particular administrative or methodological device is useless if the school does not know where it is going and why. And it is not a matter of going simply somewhere, anywhere. We have not an indefinite number of equally good societies and ways of life from which to choose. We have, in fact, only one, conditioned by our place and time, the product of the historical forces which have made our present what it is. And our choice, therefore, is only this: to work consciously and clear-sightedly for that society or to go on fumbling and being defeated for a while longer by the self-contradictions inherent in our patchings and pullings and compromises.

We are richly endowed with expressions of noble sentiments in education, expressions which constitute as impressive an exhibition of bunk as one may chance upon in a long day's travel. But noble sentiments are not bunk per se; they are not false and hypocritical because they are noble, but because

they are sentimental. They are conceived in isolation from any possible means of fulfillment and they are entered into not as concrete possibilities but as compensatory psychological mechanisms, forms of escape from an actual world in which they have no real existence or effectiveness.

It is, for example, bunk to propose that our educational system devote itself to promoting the free self-expression of the learner, not because such expression is undesirable or, in a rational society, impossible, but because the control of our existing social-economic system rests with those who do not want any such expression, unless for their own class, and have no intention of permitting it to develop. It is bunk to talk of effecting social reform by educating the "coming generations," not because reform is undesirable or impossible but because our society will not allow a "coming generation" to be educated out of a proper respect for its vested interests. It is bunk to think of decreasing crime by education so long as that education is an expression of a society in which crime is an inevitable and largely logical response on the part of certain exploited segments of the population to the existing economic order. In a word, it is bunk to pretend that we can produce by drill or precept or project method a way of behavior wholly contrary to the actual direction imposed by the social-economic system of which the learner must become a part unless he is to become an outcast. That system, however little we may like to admit it, is the basic dominating factor on which the working of all the rest of our social and educational program depends. The refusal to examine it at its roots is the major source of bunk in all departments of American life at the present moment. Its effect upon the lives and characters of pupils in school cannot be escaped.

# THE ECONOMIC-SOCIAL CRISIS AND THE PUBLIC-HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHER<sup>1</sup>

PAUL S. LOMAX

EDITOR'S NOTE: Here is a proposal by Paul S. Lomax, professor of education at New York University, for specific and thoroughgoing reorganization of the secondary-school curriculum, which, it seems to the Editor, should lead many school administrators towards the possible adoption of changes that would be appropriate in the present situation of society. A. D. W.

TWO main phases enter into this discussion: (1) the responsibility of the public-high-school teacher for and towards the economic-social crisis, and (2) a suggested social basis of public-high-school curricular reconstruction for a new age.

## THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL'S ECONOMIC-SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

What is the responsibility of the teacher for and towards the economic crisis? The answer seems clear. The educational work of our public-school system in this American democracy has been conceived as one of social purpose and quality. Training for citizenship in a democracy has become a central objective. Indeed, this objective and that of striving for occupational efficiency have been the only two major objectives on which our educational leaders have tended to be in unanimous agreement. And yet in spite of common agreement on training for citizenship and for occupational efficiency, we find that the product of our schools—high schools and colleges and universities—are apparently unable to cope intelligently and adequately with needed adjustments and readjustments in large-scale social living along national and international lines.

Teachers cannot escape their individual and group responsibility for and towards the economic and general social crisis. Education must always be, as it has always been, a partner with social change and social progress. "In fact," Professor Kilpatrick reminds us, "education taken in the broad is but society at work consciously remaking itself as it remakes its circumstances."<sup>2</sup> And he con-

tinues, "We must become socially minded and socially disposed. We must come to see jointly and severally that education and the social situation are so inextricably interwoven that we cannot truly educate except as we admit the social aim and responsibility and remake on this basis our whole school content and procedure. On the whole we are herein sadly lacking. Our teachers have thought not in terms of social responsibility but rather of subject matter and mere school keeping. Our administrators have thought too much in terms of bare business efficiency and administration and not enough of education and especially not of the possible social service of education. . . . We must all together study our social problems until we become fired with zeal for the cause of a better social day."<sup>3</sup>

If we assume that the teacher has an educational responsibility towards the economic-social crisis, our next question is, How well prepared is the teacher to discharge his responsibility? Are teachers, individually and collectively, actually giving much time to a critical study of our economic and general social problems with the purpose of formulating a practical program of advancement along both national and international lines? Is the usual teacher well informed on such economic problems as those of taxes, tariff, insurance, housing, American farm, banking, governmental regulation and control of big business?<sup>4</sup> And are such problems being studied from the point of view of the inter-

<sup>1</sup> William Heard Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, pages 47-48.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Fleming Gemmill and associates at the University of Pennsylvania, *Contemporary Economic Problems* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), 673 pages.

Also refer to Henry Hazlitt, Editor, *A Practical Program for America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1932), 133 pages.

<sup>3</sup> The term "teacher" is used in a general sense to include all members of the educational staff.

<sup>4</sup> William Heard Kilpatrick, *Education and the Social Crisis* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1932), page 4.

## THE ECONOMIC-SOCIAL CRISIS

dependence of economic life upon all other institutional phases of a comprehensive and a closely related social life in general?

Again, the answers to these questions seem clear. The usual teacher is not broadly and deeply educated for the discharge of his first educational obligation towards the creation and maintenance among his students of economic understanding, enlightened social vision, and creative insight to human betterment.

Teachers have tended to be too narrowly prepared for their social service. As our social life became increasingly complex and vast in its ramifications, naturally the individual, for the sake of simplicity and definiteness of purpose, tended more and more to narrow his specialization.

How and why this increasing specialization came about is probably well understood by all. We do not need to pause here to discuss that. The question that confronts us with reference to the economic-social crisis is, Are teachers thus highly specialized and somewhat narrowly educated really prepared to view our social system and life as a functional whole with reference to human well-being and advancement? Are the pupils themselves, educated under such a régime of more or less isolated subject units of study, really able to qualify in their thinking and acting as coöperative members of a great, coherent, and interdependent society? If business teachers, for example, cannot envisage the functioning of business endeavor as a whole in its productive, marketing, financial, consumptive, and managerial aspects, how can they lead their pupils in obtaining an overview of business endeavor as a whole, much less an overview of the entire social life of mankind in at least its simpler and more fundamental phases?

The rich soil of education has become so densely planted with specialized and separated "subject trees" of study, that teachers and pupils, as they view the different trees,

cannot see the forest as a whole on account of a multiplicity of individual trees. Such teachers and pupils are veritably lost in the woods. They are in a sad state of confusion. They have no sense of direction. They can see only a step or two ahead. Indeed, we ask Professor Jacks, "Who needs educating more than the educator himself? Who needs it so much? Whose education has been more neglected at the vital points? Among the multitudes who stand in need of education I include myself as one of the most needy. Never do I plead for education without hearing a voice which says to me, 'Thou art the man.'"<sup>5</sup>

Teachers have mostly succeeded in specializing their subject learning; they have mostly failed in generalizing their education as a whole in terms of social living. Knowledge at every point is interdependent as is life itself. No part of knowledge whether of business or of any other social institution, can be truly understood except as it is understood in its relationships to the other parts. With reference to industrial or practical arts Professor Dewey well sums up the issue. "In operation they are often immensely specialized in detail. But back of the operation there lies a concentration of knowledge derived from many sources, an integration of many processes which originated in separate arts. Consider the multiplicity of problems that have to be met by a city architect, problems not just of building, but of lighting, heating, plumbing, ventilation, elevator service, perhaps electric power, decoration, and so on. The individual architect may not be master of them all but he has to know enough to coördinate the activities of specialists in these departments. The illustration is typical of what goes on in every modern factory."<sup>6</sup> And so with the teacher, as with

<sup>5</sup> L. P. Jacks, *The Education of the Whole Man* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931), page 33.

<sup>6</sup> John Dewey, *The Way Out of Educational Confusion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931), page 17.

the architect, the coördination of the numerous phases and techniques of the school learning of his pupils, particularly with respect to desirable social life, becomes his most challenging and pressing duty. He must seek to generalize his specialty in the social living of his pupils.

#### A SOCIAL BASIS OF PUBLIC-HIGH-SCHOOL CURRICULAR RECONSTRUCTION

How can greater simplicity and unity be accomplished in our public-high-school curricula so that our pupils may get both a specialized and a unified education by which they may most wisely develop, individually and collectively, in accordance with the highest ideals of human attainment?

The focal point in the accomplishment of larger unities amid extensive specialization, in our view, is the social institution, as that of business, government, or home rather than the present-day emphasis on technique, as that of bookkeeping, mathematics, or language. Let us illustrate. In the teaching of business subjects, for instance, we have mostly stressed the techniques of typewriting, shorthand dictation, and transcription, bookkeeping, filing, business letter writing, penmanship, etc., rather than the *meaningful use* of these techniques in the functional life of business, treated as a large inclusive social institution, interdependent upon the well-being of all other fundamental social institutions. Consequently, while our pupils have tended to become efficient technicians as typists, stenographers, bookkeepers, filing clerks, and the like, these pupils have mostly failed to understand the meaning, functions, and social mission of the very business life amid which they have efficiently practised their techniques. In our opinion, a similar situation can be demonstrated to some degree in the subjects of mathematics, languages, English, physical sciences, and even of the social sciences. In other words, the trend towards a multiplicity of subjects has

been a trend of more and more specialized subjects, and this in turn has led to a trend towards an emphasis on specialized techniques. The result of this general curricular trend is revealed, in part, in a recent statistical study of the causes of labor turnover, which study showed "that lack of skill was responsible for only one third of the workers losing their jobs. The other two thirds were discharged not because of lack of efficiency but because of lack of social understanding."

To check this trend towards a possible oversteering of specialized techniques, we should organize the high-school curricula in a way to make for coherence and interdependence of social living rather than for mere diversification of more or less unrelated techniques. To accomplish this we should make social institutions the basic units of departmentalization instead of the conventional subject-matter divisions which have mostly become *technique* divisions.

The controlling educational objective which we should hold in mind in this reorganization of departmental units would be to develop in the experience of each pupil vocational and social intelligence, ethical standards, and physical well-being. Individual development consonant with wise social advancement would be the ideal towards which teachers and pupils would coöperatively and whole-heartedly work.

We present here a plan of social departmental organization:

1. Department of home education  
(Social institution of home)
2. Department of government (including legal) education  
(Social institutions of government and courts)
3. Department of economics (including business, industrial, and agricultural) education  
(Social institution of business broadly conceived as the economic system)
4. Department of ethical education



## THE ECONOMIC-SOCIAL CRISIS

(Social institution of the church dealt with on a nondenominational basis)

5. Department of recreational (including health and leisure) education

(Social institution of *organized* recreation, as typified by the theater, football, baseball, etc.)

6. Department of educational guidance and social planning

(Unification of the work of the first five departments in terms of the pupils' individual and group living within and without the school)

Every pupil under this social institutional plan would get a well-rounded education by being obliged to participate in the educational offerings of all six departments. Differentiation for diversified pupil interests and capacities would be cared for within each departmental unit, as well as by a diversity of techniques which already characterize high-school curricula.

Every teacher under this social institutional plan would be thoroughly prepared in teacher-training institutions in the fundamentals of the six departmental divisions, even as would each pupil be expected to be thus well prepared in his high-school education. Such a teacher would be licensed by the State on the basis of at least two teaching majors: one in a major social institution, as that of home, government, or business; and the other in a major technique, as that of mathematics, languages, or secretarial studies. Thus every teacher in his professional preparation and in his teaching service would tend to be obliged to make social living, appraisal, and advancement the focal consideration and, in connection with social living, to conceive of his chosen technique or techniques as *means* in the proper func-

tioning and control of worthy individual behavior consistent with group well-being.

With such techniques being learned as instrumentalities of social control and advancement, we should have the best of media for developing the basic powers of understanding, imagination, and foresight. In such a program of education we believe that the human mind and spirit, clothed within a sound body of glowing health, should continuously grow in the divine power of being able to transcend the perplexing problems of present-day human experiences and thus catch a golden vision of the ever new paths of human attainment.

## REFERENCES

1. Robert Douglas Bowden, *In Defense of Tomorrow* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), 210 pages.
2. George S. Counts, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (New York: The John Day Company, 1932), 56 pages.
3. John Dewey, *The Way Out of Educational Confusion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931), vii + 41 pages.
4. Paul Fleming Gemmell and associates at the University of Pennsylvania, *Contemporary Economic Problems* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), xv + 673 pages.
5. Henry Hazlitt, Editor, *A Practical Program for America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1932), 133 pages.
6. L. P. Jacks, *The Education of the Whole Man* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931), 155 pages.
7. William Heard Kilpatrick, *Education and the Social Crisis* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1932), 90 pages.
8. New Jersey State Course of Study in Business Economics (Trenton, N.J., State Department of Public Instruction, 1932).
9. Harrison M. Sayre, Editor, *Economic Planning—Can Depressions be Abolished* (New York: American Education Press, Inc., 1932), 24 pages.

## THE JUNIOR-HIGH-SCHOOL PROGRAM AS AN AID IN PREPARING YOUNG PEOPLE FOR OCCUPATIONAL LIFE

THOMAS DIAMOND

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Thomas Diamond, professor of education at the University of Michigan, is convinced that present economic conditions make it imperative that material be included in the curriculum of the junior high school which will stimulate young people to think intelligently about the world of work.* A. D. W.

**W**HATEVER we believe to be the function of our junior high schools we are likely to agree that those responsible for the work in them are earnestly endeavoring to meet the needs of young people from about twelve to fifteen years of age. While the question of what these needs are is a matter for debate in certain groups it is believed that prominent among them is the need for some preparation which will enable our young people to fit more effectively into some field of employment.

Our philosophy of education in the past has been based upon the idea that, in order to provide equal educational opportunity, we must prepare every young person to enter the occupational world on the college level. It has not occurred to us until recently that there are those who, because of certain limitations, cannot do college work. There are others whose financial condition prevents them from attending college. And there are still others who, strange though it may seem, prefer to enter the business world rather than go to college.

Studies which have been made have revealed the extent to which this mortality in school attendance exists at the junior-high-school age. The following figures are presented merely as additional evidence of the fact that there are many who for one reason or another separate themselves from school before they reach college. The report of the superintendent of schools in one school system informs us that approximately half of the children between fourteen and seventeen were not in school. Another superintendent in a larger city reports that out of ten thousand children who entered school at

eleven only seventeen hundred were in school at seventeen. Again, a study which was reported in the *Survey Magazine* informs us that out of fifty thousand children in New York seventeen years of age only forty-five hundred were in school. It seems reasonable to suppose that a considerable proportion of those who were not in school were at work.

The figures just quoted refer to conditions in 1920. If similar statistics were secured for 1932 it is probable that the numbers in school at the ages mentioned would be greater. During the past twenty years there has been a decided tendency towards prolonging the school experience of our young people. Formerly a boy could leave school and enter an apprenticeship agreement with an employer at fourteen or even earlier. Now, as a result of our labor laws, he is prevented from entering most skilled trades until he is eighteen. This difficulty in securing a position has caused many of our young people of junior-high-school age to remain in school. In most cases the fact that they have remained in school has not changed their intention of seeking employment as soon as they feel they are likely to meet with success.

This addition to the population of our junior high school makes it more imperative than ever that those charged with the task of administering those schools appreciate more fully their responsibility to the young people who must, who should, or who insist upon going to work at the earliest possible moment. Meeting this responsibility does not mean that any change be made in the present college preparatory curriculum.

## OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION IN JUNIOR HIGH

It does mean, however, that material be included which will stimulate the thinking of young people on the world of work and will prepare them for more intelligent participation in the activities with which they will be faced when they enter this world.

Preparation for occupational life involves at least three different types of training. In the first place the worker needs skill, he needs technical knowledge to enable him to use his skill intelligently, and he needs to have developed within him the proper attitude towards work, towards his employer, and towards his fellow workers. The extent to which the first two of these are needed by our workers varies with the individual and with the type of job he has to fill, but the third is of profound importance regardless of the occupation.

School people frequently conclude that the development of skill is the primary function of the school in preparing people for an occupation. Many of them also believe that unless there is a shop with tools and equipment preparation for work cannot be carried on. As a matter of fact the development of skill is of minor importance in school work as it can be developed just as readily, and usually more effectively on the job, after the individual has found a job. This type of preparation should not appear in the junior high school. If it appears in the public schools at all it should be found only as a special curriculum in a senior high school or in a vocational or trade school.

The teaching of the technical phases of business or industry can be taught much more readily under the conditions prevailing in school than they can be in places of employment. However, those who are likely to need the more advanced technical knowledge are those who have completed the work in the senior high school. For this reason only the more fundamental parts need be considered in the junior high school.

When we consider the development of the

proper attitudes on the part of our junior-high-school students we are confronted with a problem which has tremendous significance regardless of the occupational level into which the individual goes. In the first place it is important that our young people enter employment with the right attitude towards work. They must be made to realize that all good citizens do some kind of work. They must be led to see that although every one works some do work which necessitates wearing a black shirt while others may wear a white collar. Regardless of the garb of the worker, if the work is honest, it is worth while.

Not only must the young worker realize that all honest work is dignified but he must appreciate the reasons why the remuneration for some jobs is greater than for others.

The attitude of the worker towards his fellow worker cannot be too strongly emphasized, as coöperation is essential to the success of any business enterprise. Furthermore, the beginner in most types of occupations often learns through bitter experience that his ultimate success depends in a large measure on the extent to which he gets along with his fellows.

Then, too, the peace of our industrial group is frequently disturbed by a lack of understanding of certain fundamental questions of economics. In order that the youth who is entering industry may have a background which will enable him to evaluate the various philosophies with which he will come in contact, it is necessary that he be stimulated into thinking seriously on the problems that disturb labor. For example it is most desirable for the young worker to realize that the capitalist is not necessarily an undesirable person, and that capital is just as necessary in business as labor. He will be much more desirable as a worker if he understands why there is a difference between the cost of an article in the factory and the retail price in the store. He should appre-

ciate what "overhead" is and that light, heat, power, and rent have to be paid for even though the employer owns his own building and manufactures his own power. The popular fallacy among workers that the less a man does the more there is left for him to do should be made clear. These and many other ideas should be considered in an elementary way for the purpose of directing the thinking of the young worker towards a saner point of view based upon common sense.

Not only must those who prepare to enter employment be informed on certain fundamental economic questions but a greater effort must be made to prepare them for the task of employing usefully the leisure time which is being thrust upon the worker. Less than two decades ago a working week of sixty hours was common. Today we hear persistent rumors of the working week being reduced to thirty hours. It was pointed out earlier that the working life of the individual was shortened still further by increasing the age of entrance into employment to eighteen. In addition to this, we find a tendency on the part of some employers to discourage the employment of people over forty-five. These conditions suggest that some effort should be made in our junior high schools to prepare our prospective worker for intelligent participation in activities not connected with the world of work. It may be that the college preparatory curriculum will meet this need, but it is believed that before this is accepted an intensive study of the outside needs and interests of the average worker be made.

The problem of the junior high school in meeting the needs of the group considered in this article does not necessarily involve the introduction of expensive equipment; it does not necessitate the introduction of a number of new courses; and it does not im-

peril in any way the present program for people preparing for college.

The teacher of English might reasonably include in her class work discussion of many of the questions suggested above. These discussions might be expanded considerably in our debating clubs. The teaching of civics, mathematics, or history could also be enlivened by the introduction of other problems and questions relating to industry. The teacher of industrial arts is in an unusually strategic position for clarifying the thinking of the young people on the whole field of occupational life without reference to the specific type of work represented in his shop, and the whole teaching force might add interest to their subjects if they made an earnest effort to inform the pupils on the occupational possibilities leading out of them.

In summarizing what has been said, it is believed that the student body in our junior high schools is likely to increase as a result of the tendency to increase the age at which young people may leave school and go to work. Even though the number of pupils who go to college increases we shall still have a large number who will go to work at the earliest possible moment. Administrators of our junior high schools are responsible for the education of *all* children attending these schools.

There is no suggestion that the present curriculum should be changed. It is believed, however, that the existing subjects may be made the media through which the young worker may be made a more desirable worker while, at the same time, the other young person is being prepared for college entrance. And finally it is believed that each subject in the existing curriculum may be used effectively in contributing to the preparation of the junior-high-school pupil for intelligent participation in the world's work.



## QUANTITY OR QUALITY?

LOFTER BJARNASSON

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** *Lofter Bjarnasson, State supervisor of grammar grades and junior high schools in Utah, has reason to fear that educational damage results from the common practice of using marks as the major incentive for pupils' achievement. He sees a relationship between this practice and certain very well-known defects in the characters of many adults.*

A. D. W.

**D**URING my visit to Europe a few years ago I asked several prominent men in industry, in government, and in education, how they regarded the American people; what they considered the motivation by which we carry on our life's activities. I was not a little surprised to learn that they think of us nearly altogether as a people trying to achieve two rather common objectives; first, to make as much money as possible; second, to construct big things, big houses, big manufacturing establishments, and to make great quantities of material things.

Obviously such generalizations are faulty. There are certainly among us, as among other civilized nations, a large body of men and women actuated by loftier motives in life than those concerned with mere accumulation of material things. These men and women put service before salary, worthy achievement above rewards, and devotion to human welfare above material gain.

On the other hand, there is no denying the fact that possession in terms of material wealth is regarded by altogether too many individuals as the measure of success. The seeking of money profit rather than social and spiritual progress is apparently the dominant life motive for many Americans. In other words, they have set up a quantitative standard rather than a qualitative standard by which to evaluate life's activities. This quantitative standard runs the gamut of our economic, social, and educational life.

Whether or not the schools are partly responsible for this attitude or whether they merely reflect in their organization and administration this dominant motivation, I do

not wish to discuss at this point, but of this I am certain, that thousands of our youth think of education in terms of quantity rather than quality. To these young people the measure of an individual's learning and scholarship is the grades he has achieved, the credits he has earned, and the degrees that have been conferred upon him. Many of them are apparently more concerned with getting the external evidences of learning rather than the internal realities. They are after the rewards for effort rather than the intellectual disciplines acquired through disinterested application. They struggle for immediate, concrete, and easily identified goals rather than remote, spiritual, and intangible goals of worthy character and disinterested service. They think in terms of a quantitative standard.

The reasons for this prevailing and all too general attitude of our youth are not hard to find if we but look closely into the incentives used in our schools. Of these the most common and in many respects the most vicious is the marking and grading system. From the time a pupil enters the first grade of the public school to the day he graduates from college or university, he is confronted with the challenge, "get the mark," and the mark is a quantitative evaluation of the tasks he has performed, the exercises he has done, and the problems he has solved. Often, yes, too often, the mark a student gets bears no relation to what he knows, or what he understands, or the degree of his intellectual and spiritual development. It merely indicates ground covered, time spent, facts recalled and reproduced, or something easily expressed in quantitative terms.

The use of these marks and grades in the public schools comes from two sources. In the first place, they have come down by tradition from the time when the public school was regarded as a selective institution. By the use of comparative marks the teacher could select out of the group those pupils who gave evidence of being able to pursue learning with a view of becoming leaders in business, governmental, or social institutions. The assumption was that it is more important to train leaders for public service than to train average individuals for the ordinary pursuits of life. In the second place, the use of marks has been lifted downward from the higher institutions of learning. Because of the service which these institutions are expected to render, they are highly selective; that is, they are charged with the responsibility of allowing no one not properly qualified to enter technical and professional service. Hence they are forced to use various selective devices and, in all probability, among these the comparative marking system is best suited to their purpose. But the public school whose function is to train all the children of all the people has no such selective responsibility. Its duty is to make of each individual the best possible citizen that he is capable of becoming. Its purpose is not merely to train for intelligent leadership, but also for intelligent followership, for in a democracy there can be no sharp line of demarcation between leadership and followership. Any sort of selective devices through the use of which some pupils are encouraged and others discouraged is, therefore, out of place in the common schools. Some other incentive than the getting of marks and credits must be used if the public school is to achieve its high purpose. Any system of rewards and distinctions other than the satisfaction that comes from a consciousness of self-improvement and increased personal ability to achieve is

likely to lead to the moral breakdown of many individuals.

Is it any wonder that when the emphasis is placed on amount the pupil loses sight of quality? His daily lessons are assigned in terms of a definite number of pages to be covered, problems to be solved, sentences to be diagrammed, and words to be memorized. In the preparation of such assignments the pupil is often left to his devices. He learns as best he can. If he does well, he is praised and given a high mark. If he does poorly, he is chided and given a low mark. The amount of his learning is compared quantitatively with that of his classmates. The pupil who gets the highest number gets the highest mark. This arbitrary, quantitative standard puts a premium on the docile, tractable individual who has a good verbal memory regardless of understanding. It tends to discourage the slow-working, deliberate individual. It tends to destroy initiative, curiosity, and spontaneity. For the average pupil it makes of school work a laborious performance of tasks rather than a glorious, intellectual venture. No doubt the giving of marks and grades affords an incentive to a limited group of fast workers but it certainly tends to stultify the efforts of a large group of slow workers. It is a schoolroom literal application of the theological dogma, "To him that hath shall be given and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." To the pupil who because of hereditary endowment or previous training remembers well the facts he has heard or read, a reward in the form of a high mark is given, while from the pupil not so well endowed or equipped is taken away even the little incentive he had when he began his study.

If the evils of the marking system implied in the foregoing discussion were the only ones it might not be so serious, but an inescapable outcome of the system is the de-

## QUANTITY OR QUALITY?

velopment of the "get-by" attitude. Pupils of average or lower than average ability soon learn to do no more than is needed to get a passing mark. That represents to them sufficient attainment. This invariably leads to half learning, half doing, and slipshod application instead of thorough, conscientious effort. It leads to the endeavor to "get the mark, honestly if you can, but get the mark." And so teachers of every level of our public-school system are confronted with all kinds of ingenious devices for getting grades, marks, and credits with as little conscientious effort as possible. The giving of rewards in the form of marks has led to classroom dishonesty. Cheating is in evidence in every classroom from kindergarten to college. One pupil copies another's notes and hands them in as his own; another recites from a textbook full of cribbing; still another hands to his teacher problems worked out for him by an older brother or sister. This cheating is so general and so rampant that students in high school and college have been known to flaunt their dishonesty in the very faces of their teachers, in some instances with the cynical remark that they are only doing what is commonly done in life and since the school is supposed to train for life the teachers have no occasion to take offense. Racketeering in getting grades and marks has become as common as racketeering in business.

The struggle to achieve a quantitative standard rather than a qualitative standard is glaringly apparent in our social and economic life. We see among workers in almost every line of human endeavor a large number imbued with the attitude of getting the highest possible reward for the least possible service. Only occasionally do we find an individual who is more concerned with the

worthiness of his work than the wages he expects to receive. There are altogether too many who are actuated by the "get-by" attitude. To get something for little leads gradually to the desire to get something for nothing. In the wake of this attitude follows a train of evil and immoral practices too numerous to mention let alone to discuss. Our criminal courts are filled with endless lines of beardless youths who bear upon their countenances evidences of the operation of this attitude in their lives. A large percentage of these youths tried to get something without giving legitimate service in return for it; in fact they tried to get something for nothing. Many of them are the embodiment of the "get-the-mark" attitude so prevalent in our school system. The lives of hundreds of others who may be more fortunate in that they have escaped the talons of the law are daily being warped and shriveled by the withering breath of this type of motivation. They have interpreted life in terms of quantity rather than in terms of quality.

It is gratifying to note that some school systems have eliminated all marks and grades and other quantitative measures in the elementary schools. Very definite modification of this system is in progress in some of our progressive junior high schools. This change has not come about without struggle. Parents steeped in old traditions have been the most vigorous opponents. However, in favored systems where marks have not been in use for several years, both parents and children are happier than they were under the old system. In these modern schools there is a finer spirit of coöperation and good will than ever characterized the schools of the traditional type. Omission of marks clears up a source of friction.

## EDUCATION AND THE PRODUCTION LINE

LAURENCE B. BRINK

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Laurence B. Brink is principal of the Monticello Junior High School in Cleveland Heights, Ohio. In the article which follows he points out a fallacy in the thinking of many educators that arises out of a too general acceptance of the industrial principles of mass production.* A. D. W.

IN THE shadow cast by the chimneys of one of the world's greatest automobile factories is a city whose school system is patterned in some respects after the theories of industrial management advocated by Mr. Henry Ford. I have no first-hand knowledge of the success of educational practices there. Doubtless statistical studies on that subject have been made. What I have to say in these paragraphs is based on philosophical considerations alone and is intended not to cast discredit upon any particular school system, but to bring into the light for critical examination a theory of supervision to which many of us have perhaps unconsciously given our assent. My thesis is that the methods of industrial management, however successful in their own field, cannot be successful in education, and that a supervisor who undertakes to direct education by such methods is guilty of self-deception.

As I understand Mr. Ford's management, not only the large policies but the details of manufacture are determined by experts. These are precisely specified and rigidly adhered to. Thus the individual workman is freed from all responsibility for planning. His efforts are directed towards the development of a specific skill in a very narrow range. He attains great speed and accuracy. Thus he is enabled to turn out a superior product with greater profit to himself, his employer, and the consumer. It is contended that the planning is better done than by individual initiative and that there is better utilization of time, materials, and equipment. Thus management has come to be, in the industrial world, a factor coördinate with capital and labor in the production of manufactured goods.

Perhaps it is the result of the rapid industrialization of the country that a similar theory seems to be increasingly prevalent in the field of education. Perhaps, on the other hand, it results from the ambition of the earnest, trained, and expert supervisors who hope to contribute as much to the success of their product as the automotive engineers to that of theirs. The possibility of following an analogous method is apparent and alluring. The fallacies in the analogy are not so obvious.

If I were a believer in the omnipotence of management in education, and if I were placed in charge of a secondary school with no limitation upon my freedom of organization nor upon my expenditure for the service of experts, I should set up some such plan as this. There would be a detailed study of the nature of the pupils and a statistical analysis of the findings. Courses of study would next be prepared, beginning with the objectives of the subject and including the materials of instruction arranged in psychological learning units, each with its own understandings, appreciations, and other desired outcomes. Accompanying the course of study, and essentially a part of it, would be the whole body of exercises by which the pupils were to learn, all applicable to the purposes of the course of study. Carefully devised objective tests, which in time would be standardized, would accompany the exercises and workbooks. Teachers' manuals would tell precisely how to use the exercises, how to administer the tests, and how to re-teach, reclassify, or promote pupils. If all this were perfectly done and the school scientifically organized, teaching would be a simple, pleasant, clerical task, and supervi-



## EDUCATION AND THE PRODUCTION LINE

sion only the duty of inspection to see that all teachers were following directions. Teaching costs would be much decreased, since classes could be made very large. Teachers need not have any special qualifications except industry and clerical accuracy.

The plausibility of such procedure depends upon acceptance of the premise that the task of education is essentially like that of manufacture. It is true that we can think of both in terms of raw material, processes, and product. But such parallel is not real; it is only a figure of speech, useful as an illustrative or clarifying trope. A little examination will reveal the lack of identity between the cases.

The scientific basis upon which industrial management rests must be the possibility of control of the three factors mentioned: the raw material, the processes, and the product. I understand that the first step is design. The engineers must set up specifications for the finished article. These are elaborated, detailed, precisely dimensioned. Then the raw materials are decided on. They must satisfy certain standards, or must be brought to such standards, before they can enter the processes of manufacture. Only from uniform materials can a uniform product be made. What is unworthy must be rejected or must be pretreated to bring it into conformity with the requirement. A batch of steel, for example, may be freed from sulphur, its carbon content may be increased or decreased, until it is perfectly adapted to the manufacturer's need. The third range of control is control of processes. Design of machinery, routing of materials, division and distribution of operations are but a few phases of this part of management.

Now, far be it from me to undervalue the scientific, because quantitative, controls that have been developed to assist us in education. It is desirable that we learn all we can of the raw material that comes to us. Within the limits of the funds available, I should

wish every child to be studied in detail. Psychological, psychiatric, and physiological examinations, studies of home and school history, recording and evaluation of all the biological and sociological facts about a pupil are valuable instruments in our efforts to help him to realize his possibilities. Similarly, the technique of teaching has been vastly improved by the scientific studies of method. The only regrettable fact is that too often convincing statistical evidence of the superiority of a given technique lies buried between the covers of an academic dissertation instead of being made the basis of changes in classroom procedure.

But in spite of the contributions of science to education, my contention is that education is in essence incapable of scientific control comparable to the scientific control of manufacture, and that this incapability is due, not primarily to the immature development of educational and psychological science, but to the very nature of our materials and our objectives. In accordance with the foregoing analysis, three conditions must be fulfilled if we are to have scientific control in education and I maintain that none of them can be fulfilled. We must be able to describe pupils as they come to us in at least approximately accurate mathematical terms. We must be able to direct the technique of teaching without much interference of the personal factor after the experts have prepared the finished course of study and the directions. Finally, we must be able to make quantitative specifications of our intended outcomes and to impose convincing tests as to the success of our efforts. These things, I believe, cannot be done and it would be unfortunate for education if they ever could be done.

Take the matter of the raw materials. It is unnecessary to reiterate the infinite variety of personality that we have to deal with in our pupils. Tests of native ability and achievement in various directions, analyses

and profiles of personality characteristics, constantly more highly elaborated and refined, are of great assistance in helping us to understand the individuals who come to us. But human beings are characterized by so many variables that, unlike steel and rubber, they can never conceivably be described in mathematical terms. Nor can we reject what does not satisfy the specifications; we must deal with what we have. Humanity, thank God, is not capable of standardization. Thus, at the very first step of the educational process, scientific control is impossible.

The process of teaching is more closely analogous to that of manufacture. Laborious controlled experimentation has taught us much about the psychology of learning. Perhaps we shall never arrive at the one best method of teaching, but we are continually finding that in this detail or that a given technique is better than another. Every improvement in method is a new tool in the hand of the teacher. Yet an ideal perfect method would be stale, flat, and unprofitable without the vivifying power of the teacher. The interest necessary for learning, or the "impressiveness" more recently recognized, can arise only from the candent spirit of the teacher fusing with that of the pupil. Lacking imagination and intensity in the teacher, not all the apparatus and intellectually conceived method in the world will produce a true learning situation.

When it comes to specification and testing of the finished product, the ways of industry and of education are farther apart than ever. Would you lay out a template or a format by which to standardize the educated man? Readers of Huxley's *Brave New World* will not have forgotten the depressing horror with which they contemplated the standardized educational product of the civilization there pictured. Uniform lots of ectogenetic twins delivered to order for use in industry.

Groups of individuals of caste A, B, or C, each conditioned to fill his predetermined place in the social order. I prefer the specifications drawn by Dr. Hubbard of the Bureau of Standards. The educated man must be unique, free, experimental, sensitive, unafraid, skilled in all his potential powers. Such qualities deny all possibility of specification or of measurement. Plato, Shakespeare, and Lincoln were never designed on a draughting board or assembled on a production line.

Understand me. I would not deny the importance, the indispensability, of science in education. But the results of scientific research are an instrument for the teacher's use, not a method of control. To think otherwise is as absurd as a prominent superintendent's recent statement that there is no need for a teacher to have personal acquaintance with the pupils. The province of supervision, as I conceive it, is not to control but to strengthen. A course of study with its related body of exercises as a supervisory device is not to be thought of as controlling and directing instruction. It is the medium through which the teacher works. It does not limit and confine the play of his spirit; it sets his spirit free.

Teaching is not and should not be essentially a science; it is a creative art. The artist in painting or in architecture makes use of new materials and new techniques developed for him by his servant, science. He is not limited by them, but uses them for his own more complete expression. The teacher is not an administrator of devices, a clerk to record test results, a manipulator of techniques. At his best he is a flaming spirit, igniting the spirit of his pupil, quickening the imagination, stirring into life all the potential personality before him. The results may never appear in a doctoral dissertation, but they will be true education, nevertheless.

## THE BUNK IN GRADE CLASSIFICATION OF PUPILS

CHARLES F. ALLEN

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Charles F. Allen, supervisor of secondary education in Little Rock, Arkansas, believes that pupils suffer injustice as a result of the current system of grade classification and promotion. We find it rather easy to agree with his point of view.* A. D. W.

**B**Y GRADE classification is meant the practice of assigning and promoting pupils according to years of supposed school work. It is a remnant of the old lock-step plan of promotion, long condemned but still generally practised.

If a pupil fails in his one, two, or three subjects, as the local practice may be, he must spend another half year (or a year) going over the same work which may have been done well. The absurdities of the plan are better illustrated by the sentinels of school marks which guard entrance into the high school, and still more emphasized by the straight line wall that seemingly attempts to prevent entrance to college. One unaccustomed to general school practices would think the purpose is to keep as many as possible from high school and college rather than to make the school serve the student's needs.

Fortunately some schools have varied from the more general practice and are promoting conditionally, promoting when only a fraction of a grade is failed, promoting by subjects, using various schemes of individualization of subject work, making use of special rooms for individual help, and devising other schemes to care for problems of promotions. But the practice in classifying goes on and to an accentuated degree as the student reaches higher levels in his educational career. Possibly college domination will yet bring some solution. The University of Chicago experiment is a hopeful sign. May its influence so stimulate a study of the problem of promotions in the public schools that some competent committee will be appointed by some influential and earnest school organization which will attack the problem with such vigor and sincere earnestness that

a sound and satisfying solution will be found.

A few brief examples will make the problem clear. In one of our large Eastern cities a pupil who fails in one subject in eighth grade must repeat that grade for a year, in another city that same pupil would repeat only a half year, and in another large city close by he would not repeat at all. Furthermore that same pupil might have failed by a mere fraction in one city while if ranked by the same test in another school within the same city he would have been among the average group. Possibly his cousin in another system answered the same questions and failed as he did but the cousin comes to this city with his transfer certificate and is entered in the next higher grade. Then, too, the success of each has depended largely upon teacher opinion; their marks represent neither a reliable test of what has been done nor of what either is able to do.

One of the best students in a Mid-Western high school took extra work and had fourteen units of high-school credits; his classmate was a much slower pupil who had spent an extra year and thus secured the required fifteen units of credits. The former student was ready for good college work; the latter was later dropped from college. The former drifted along the next year while earning his college entrance unit through correspondence work. Little consideration was given to determining whether either was really able to profit by work in his own tax-supported State university.

Two students received diplomas from the same State teachers college. By carrying an extra subject and hard work, one completed his course in three years and with high marks; the other idled his four years away and completed his course in four years but

with low marks. Both entered the same large Northern university but the former's credits were reduced for no better reason than that he had been industrious and had applied himself to his work.

In a certain large junior high school assigned pupils were classified by respective heads of departments. The subject matter in the local curriculum was arranged in a different sequence from that in many schools of the State. A transfer pupil had either to submit a standard accredited certificate covering the subject matter of the local curriculum or take a test covering the particular subject matter in which he usually failed to pass. The result was that a transfer was often classified in seventh grade in one subject, in eighth grade in another, and in ninth grade in a third subject; the inconsistency was further emphasized by the refusal of the head of the department concerned to give the transferred pupil credit for work successfully completed and corresponding to requirements in a higher grade in her curriculum. Fortunately under recent leadership that school is attempting to promote and to accept by transfer on the basis of ability to do the work and to profit most by where placed.

Again, such a condition as the one following is only too common: If a pupil misses a month from his own school having a nine-month term he is doomed to failure; but his country cousin with an eight-month term, possibly absent the same calendar days, has completed his eight months and received his certificate of transfer. This certificate is

readily accepted in the school of a nine-month term although this country cousin did his eight months' work under poorly prepared and poorly equipped teachers. Furthermore, almost any school administrator knows that the range within a class is generally far greater than the difference between the grade standards. Here again the criteria is not ability to profit by the advanced work; but it is a certified statement little better than a guess.

Some administrators and teachers think they have solved the problem of promotions by testing and ranking results, and then they often rank members of respective classes instead of ranking all members of the grade in the school. Standard tests, accomplishment quotients, age, I.Q.'s, hospital classes, individualized instruction, subject promotion or partial subject promotions, enriched curricula, slow and fast classes, extra subjects, and vacation schools are some of the present indications that school administrators are beginning to consider the problem; but in most of these schemes the original problem remains—How can the values of mass instruction be retained and the advantages of individual instruction be secured? Will it not require the emphasis to be placed on ability to profit most where placed rather than on doubtful achievement based upon rank, marks, and grades? Isn't it time to devise a new scheme of promotions? Isn't there some one or some organization that will take the lead in attempting to remedy the wrong so often being done by the present schemes of promotions?



## BUNK IN HIGHER EDUCATION

J. O. CREAGER

EDITOR'S NOTE: J. O. Creager, professor of education at New York University, points out the need for extensive revision of procedures in college teaching. If we agree with him that the college is unable to define its destination, formulate its program, or measure its results, then we must agree that the need for reform is urgent.

A. D. W.

IN THE DAYS of the Lyceum lecturer, I recall once hearing a man present a vivid burlesque portrayal of an overdiligent housewife with her dustpan and her broom assiduously "hunting for dirt." Few who have read it will ever forget Theodore Roosevelt's description of *The Man with the Muck-Rake*. The editors of *THE CLEARING HOUSE* must have had in mind an experiment in this type of literary endeavor when they sent forth their call for contributions to a debunking number of their magazine. They, rather than the contributors of this diabolical edition, should, therefore, be held responsible for results. For in the language of Shylock we are moved to say: "The villainy you teach me I will execute; and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction."

To set out deliberately upon the bold enterprise of exposing the weaknesses of our system of higher education might seem an expedition of disloyalty to one's profession were it not that the critics of colleges and universities have in recent years been so numerous that heretics apparently outnumber the orthodox.

The most shameful admission that must be made at the very inception is that we can neither define higher education nor agree upon its aims and purposes. We cannot delimit its sphere of action nor agree upon its program. A notable conference was recently held at which the central theme was the relation of the universities to the social order. While there was no agreement at the conference as to just what this relationship is, it is at least encouraging to note that the suspicion is at last emerging that some such relationship should exist.

The traditional conception upon this topic,

though mediaeval in its origin, is still the one which largely prevails. It runs to the effect that universities are free, self-determining guilds of scholars<sup>1</sup> existing to extend and perpetuate learning. In establishing this idea those early institutions, nearly nine centuries ago, made a valuable contribution. But it is the modern abuse of this idea that constitutes the first large and persistent piece of bunk that I bring to lay upon *THE CLEARING HOUSE* altar.

That institutions of higher learning should be left largely free to determine their policies, programs, and methods no sane person would question. But the idea that such freedom does not carry with it a correlative obligation to society is clearly beyond the comprehension of the wayfaring man.

The medieval tradition, reinforced at Halle in the seventeenth century by the doctrine of *Lehr- und Lernfreiheit*, reaches us in the form of the sacred slogan known as "Academic Freedom." It is not my purpose here to review the voluminous literature upon this age-worn topic. Like Banquo's ghost it still serves to embarrass the guests at well-nigh every educational banquet table. I merely wish to say that it will probably continue to do so as long as the academic household remains divided against itself. As long as the Association of University Professors, who for many years have kept this as their central theme, hold to the ruling that college presidents are not eligible to its membership, the scheme of things is nicely designed to perpetuate a misunderstanding which the laity entirely fails to grasp.

<sup>1</sup> See Gabriel Compayré, *Abelard and the Origin and Early History of the Universities* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), page 137.

But the general doctrine of the perpetuation of guilds of scholars has further weaknesses as an educational aim in this day and age of the world. It tends to lay a protective tariff upon types of scholarship dependent upon certain preferred fields of learning. What the student learns in college today is largely determined by tradition and vested interests in subject matter rather than by individual or social needs. The A.B. degree is still largely given for a nicely balanced ration of credits in fields determined not by a study of the students' needs, nor by the needs of the social order, but by the fine old art of faculty-jockeying and horse trading. Nearly every progressive public-school system in the United States has, within the past two decades, carried to completion a thorough-going program of curriculum revision in which their faculties have participated under the leadership of experts in this field invited from without. But one would search a long time to find a single college or university that has made such a study with equal thoroughness. In fact it is only recently that the institutions of higher education have become aware of the need of such an enterprise and their faculties are, for the most part, largely unacquainted with the literature and practices in this field.

Most of the recent innovations in curriculum change in colleges and universities have been of a purely empirical character brought about either by faculty committees or by the administrative fiat of some progressive, dynamic executive. The honors system with its accompanying comprehensive examination has lately become quite popular as a means of redress of grievances. But it is purely doctrinaire in its attack, begging the major premise while imitating the English tradition and betraying a supreme faith in the idea that education is synonymous with the mastery of compact fields of subject matter. It does not deal at all with the problem of the relative values of subject matter. Rather

does it assume, in this respect, the sanctity of tradition. It proposes a new method of learning and examining, not a reconsideration of the course of study. The fact is, higher education is devoid of both a philosophy and a program. Many interesting and valuable experiments are under way; but compared with education at elementary and secondary levels, there is, as yet, no well-conceived policy nor a professionally prepared staff of workers.

Nor is this all. There is no agreement among faculties in colleges and universities that higher education is a subject worthy of study. Rather the agreement runs in the opposite direction—that all study of education is "the bunk." The moment proposals are made by college executives in this direction, latent apathy becomes active antipathy. Organizations, such as the Association of Liberal Arts Colleges and the Association of American Universities, have addressed diplomatic messages to the graduate schools suggesting that something be done in the direction of the professional preparation of the future college teacher. They have scarcely dared to mention that the professor might benefit by the study of education. What has happened? The answer may be found in the programs of the graduate schools. For the future professor to know something of the history of higher education, even in his own land, is entirely unnecessary. For him to know anything of the psychology of the student he teaches is totally beside the point. For him to have wasted his time considering such topics as the objectives of colleges and universities, curriculum study, the improvement of college instruction, and other such meaningless pedagogic jargon would be utter sacrilege. The answer is clear. Let college and university executives take note. The future college teacher is to be professionalized by keeping himself unspotted by professional studies.

It is obvious that an attitude of this sort

## BUNK IN HIGHER EDUCATION

towards the study of education cannot long persist. For him who can read, the handwriting is already on the wall. The ancient feud between professors of education and other types of professors cannot long continue. There is ample evidence that this sort of "kid's play" is fast passing. The programs of research that are now on in many of the universities are tying up the academic and the education faculties in coöperative studies that have already gone far to destroy the petty prejudices that have existed. When the problems of higher education become the joint enterprise of both the academic and the educational faculty member the entire situation is strengthened both from the standpoint of valid research and that of faculty *esprit de corps*. But this is too hopeful a note for the man with the muck-rake. The scavenger must return to his task.

It would seem plausible that if a man were on a journey but knew not whither he was going nor by what means he was to subsist while en route he would not take great pains to measure his progress day by day. We have shown—we hope, satisfactorily—that higher education does not have a very clear conception of its itinerary, nor is it in agreement with itself as to what should constitute the pabulum of the educand while he is on his way. Why, then, should it take such infinite pains to measure his progress?

Can we measure his progress? The answer to this depends upon what it is that we wish to measure. If education is the mastery of subject matter, we can measure that only indifferently well. But if education is growth, as our tallest philosophers maintain, the task is not so easy. The situation is further complicated by the fact that we are just now at the crossroads as to our methods of measurement. The old system of essay examination, teachers' marks, semester hours credit, etc., is receiving nothing but unkind words these days. The newer system, which is historically older still, holds out for larger bodies of sub-

ject matter, honors work, comprehensive examinations, etc. And latest of all come the proponents of growth who propose to keep a continuous record of the student, in terms of his out-of-school life and his rating on the new coöperative tests. These latter propose to test objectively the student's achievement in certain large fields of subject matter. Page the Pennsylvania Study in secondary and higher education.

And so we return by a different route to the point from which we set out at the beginning. We are not clear as to what it is that we wish to accomplish. For higher education to have to admit this seems a great weakness. But this appears to be the truth. And, being the truth, it constitutes a first-class argument for a more searching study of higher education—its philosophy, its program, its method, on the part of those working in this field. Yet is it not so much easier and far more comfortable, to accept the status quo, go on with our teaching, our examining, our marking, and record keeping, taking for granted the validity of that which tradition has passed down to us? Easier and more comfortable indeed; but impossible if progress is to be made.

Not being able to define its destination, formulate its program, or measure its results, we may falteringly propose the further question, "Does the college know its students?" The answer is: "It does not and up to date has been rather proud of the fact." For here again tradition comes to the front with the old doctrine of irresponsibility. The college professor is an authority in his chosen subject and the college would be a pleasant place for him were it not for the pestiferous student. When a few years ago a statistically minded young candidate for the Ph.D. at the Ohio State University laid down the facts as to what happened to freshmen at that institution, and the causes back of these facts, the articles of indictment in his autopsy were so clear that the president of

the institution addressed a *communiqué* to his faculty, running somewhat as follows. He called attention to the fact that, by State law, the University must admit all graduates of standard high schools in Ohio. These graduates come in great numbers. They likewise depart in great numbers with little to their credit except failure. The causes are various. But many of them are causes for which the faculty rather than the freshmen are responsible. Some of the results of this study at Ohio State are a State-wide pre-entrance testing program for high-school students, an elaborate system of guidance in freshman year, and a system of junior deans for the supervision of teaching.

Progressive universities no longer point with pride to their high percentages of freshman mortality. Instead they are seeking to find teachers of freshmen who may contribute to longevity rather than mortality. For we are finding that there is a teaching problem of some proportions in these first two college years. Research studies dealing with the records of junior-college graduates who transfer to universities at the junior-year level all run much to the same effect. These students prove to be superior to the native born who entered the same university as freshmen. Furthermore, the testimony of these junior-college transfers is practically unanimous to the effect that the systems of instruction and guidance in junior colleges are superior to those of the university. It would appear that the junior-college movement is destined to force the four-year col-

leges and universities to reorganize their first two years in terms of improved practices in teaching and student guidance as well as a reconsideration of the curriculum. In fact that movement is already under way. There are those who protest and lament the passing of the good old days, saying with vehemence, "This is not real college work." The reply is that it never was. Tappan of Michigan went on record to that effect before the Civil War and Harper of Chicago said essentially the same thing a few decades later.

Other items might be included in a bill of indictment against higher education, if this be such. But when we look at the subject historically, the universities were and are social institutions. A number of social factors contributed to their founding. Some of these furnished the very practices which have made the university an organization tough in fiber and resistant to change. Despite this, during the nine centuries of their history they have at times been greatly modified in terms of profound changes in the social order. Perhaps it is better that in the evolution of a great social institution demands from without should be made to prove the merits of their case and that a gradual evolution is better than revolutions. Such, at any rate, seems to be what has happened. They have borne the whips and scorns of time. They have felt the sting of many a Socratic gadfly. They will doubtless survive the gibes of future CLEARING HOUSE critics. How interesting it would be to have a picture of them nine centuries hence.



## PRO PATRIA—?

*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*

HENRY C. FENN

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Living for the world, rather than dying for one's country, as an inspiration for participation in the good life is the theme of the following article by Henry C. Fenn, of the Oak Lane Country Day School of Temple University.* A. D. W.

IF WE could bring Horace back from Hades—where he has doubtless from his association with eighteenth-century classicists acquired a fondness for paired couplets—he might give us a counterpoise to his much quoted aphorism; it would run something like this: *Difficile et sine laude pro mundo vivere*. Some such corollary is needed to put life into the old saying, for methods in modern warfare have raised doubts as to the dulcitude and decorousness of becoming cannon fodder, and the only way to save Horace's face is to provide such an offset to the line that a free translator might squeeze out of it the meaning, "However sweet and proper it may be to die for one's country, it's a hard and thankless task to live for the world." It is by no means easy for the average adult of today, with a social inheritance from a generation of Americans even more isolationistic in point of view than the present generation, to overcome that narrow nationalism with which he was imbued in school and to face the problems of a changing civilization with open mind.

What is it in our schooling that has constricted our interests and strangled those naturally cosmopolitan sympathies with which we came into the world?

"I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," chants class after class of American school children. This simple pledge contains nothing essentially narrowing, yet the interpretation given it by teachers seems to have limited the pupils' horizon. Only a very ardent communist could claim that loyalty to "my flag and the Republic for which it stands" is es-

entially at odds with the conception of world brotherhood, and that only by limiting "world brotherhood" to the proletariat. Furthermore, if "liberty and justice for all" be interpreted to mean not merely for all within our borders—a very limited interpretation and still more limited in its degree of present realization—but to mean a free intercourse of peoples, black, red, yellow, brown, and white, the world over, and justice in terms of the golden rule, there is nothing in the pledge to offend the most rabid internationalist.

The difficulty lies, of course, in the interpretation of the words and in their translation into deeds. "Liberty and justice for all" is a mockery as long as men are condemned to death on circumstantial evidence because they hold a communistic creed, as long as we refuse to place Asiatics on the same harmless immigration-quota basis with Europeans, and as long as certain States bootleg the Fourteenth Amendment instead of educating the Negro up to his responsibilities under it.

Now this little ceremony of pledging allegiance has, like most ceremonies, a desired objective. Just as stained-glass windows, altars, and candles create an atmosphere of sanctity conducive to worship, so the flag creates an atmosphere of civic responsibility, and to that extent it serves a worthy purpose. Just as the sacraments of religion give form to the participant's ideals, so the ceremony of the flag reminds the student of the national ideals in which he shares. But even as that most catholic of sacraments commemorating the Last Supper is sometimes vitiated by an antisocial interpretation

known as "closed communion," so our unlimited concept of "liberty and justice for all" is frequently hedged about with shackling reservations indicating a fear lest a more generous interpretation savor of nihilism.

In our teaching of history there arise the same problems of point of view and interpretation. In an age when we tried to preserve a haughty isolation from the world it may—or may not—have been sufficient to give the high-school student a year of American history and possibly a second year in which he either surveyed the history of Europe from the earliest times to the present or concentrated on one of its three arbitrary divisions: ancient, medieval, and modern history. Today a man whose cultural background is limited to the classical and Germanic traditions can hardly read intelligently a high-class newspaper or an informational magazine. When he reads that India's self-government problem is the distant result of a series of migration waves he is soon lost in a tangle of meaningless names. To him Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Manchus, Tibetans, and Mongols all have slanted eyes; so he sees little reason while they should not all be one big happy family. As for Latin America, that is to many "gringos" merely the noisy backyard over which Uncle Sam has kindly extended the aegis of the Monroe Doctrine.

American history has been kept a thing apart—free from entangling alliances with the outer world. Our pettiest president and most pusillanimous politician gets more attention than our foremost diplomats and apostles of culture. Generals still play a greater part in our history than do the leaders of peace-time activities. Not often is the student allowed the perspective of a foreign historian's judgment on the events of our history.

Such a biased presentation of the progress of civilization may create a good material for a draft army for the next war, but it

can do precious little to prevent that war.

It seems to me that a few guiding principles can be laid down for the reorientation of all patriotic exercises and of the social studies in primary and secondary schools.

1. Let it be accepted that just as a citizen owes a duty to his city, the city to the State, the State to the Federal union, and therefore the citizen to his State and nation as well as to his immediate municipality; so the United States of America owes a duty to the commonwealth of nations of which it is, willy-nilly, a part, and therefore the American citizen by virtue of his American citizenship is a citizen also of the commonwealth of mankind and owes to it a very real allegiance. Allegiance after all does not primarily arise out of an artificial relationship established by law; it is based on natural community of interests and community of life. Only a distorted and vicious nationalism places political allegiance ahead of the honest allegiance of a man's mind and conscience. And if we care to press further the parallelism drawn above, we must admit that as a citizen is expected to place loyalty to a nation before loyalty to a State or town, so in this new age of world community he is forced by reason to place the interests of mankind as a whole before the interests of his particular political division.

2. It follows "as does the day the night" that the historical background of the average citizen must, for the needs of an international age, be broadened so as to touch all peoples. Anything short of this should characterize a man as provincial. Grant that for practical purposes, and in view of limitations on the time of teacher and student, the intimate history of many minor groups of people must be neglected; nevertheless it is incumbent upon our schools to make their background courses in history cover at least the major cultures of mankind such as the Islamic, the Hindu, and the Chinese, in addition to our Euro-American culture.

## PRO PATRIA—?

3. The natural child of the two principles set forth above is a third which would insist that national histories be so revised that the major emphasis will be placed on the contribution of any particular nation to world culture and advancement with a correspondingly lessened emphasis on all details of national record which do not contribute vitally to the interpretation of national culture and ideals.

4. The boys who lived in the trenches in 1914-1918 pretty well "debunked" the maxim of Horace that it is in any sense sweet to die, whether for fatherland or for those so-called ideals for which, we were persuaded, the fatherland was fighting. It has been suggested that those who talk of "making the supreme sacrifice" haven't made it. The tasks of today demand that we stop singing "Glory and love to the men of old" who were "ready to die for fatherland" and take up the infinitely difficult and thankless job of living for the whole world.

When I say "we," I mean first and foremost teachers, for until the attitude of teachers has changed towards certain problems there can be little hope of imbuing the child with higher ideals of world citizenship. It involves a willingness to forgo considerations of national security—a most selfish doctrine when France is the proponent, merely "adequate protection" when we imagine the United States threatened. It involves giving general application to the principle invoked by Secretary Hughes when, in 1921, he committed this country to reduction of naval armament regardless of the action of other countries in the faith that an example would be more persuasive than argument. It calls

for the rejection of the concept of "national honor" and the willingness to have submitted to an impartial tribunal any and every dispute between this country and any other country. It demands the acceptance of the principle that only common prosperity can be lasting prosperity and a consequent willingness to have all problems considered in common international council. It involves not merely the acceptance of the Briand-Kellogg doctrine in principle but its application to the extent of ostracizing every violator of the world's peace. It means finally the acceptance by each individual of the obligation to live world brotherhood in personal relations with the members of all races, to oppose narrow nationalism and bigotry, to vote according to the dictates of his highest intelligence instead of those of unworthy emotions, and to conduct an active propaganda in the interest of these ideals.

Can such ideals be attained through our schools? No, not over night. The individual teacher can go so far and no farther along some of these lines without losing his job. Those higher up have yet in many localities to be educated up to the new ideals. Parents have yet to be convinced that their children should be educated not for "those things which are behind" but for "those things which are before." Colleges are yet to be persuaded that a broader preparation does not necessarily mean a shallow one. But it can be done. A few schools—like Secretary Hughes—have already ventured upon experiments in the faith that the results will be accepted. What better patriotism than to take upon oneself the difficult and thankless task of living for the world!

## THE CURE-ALL FOR EVERYTHING?

CLYDE R. MILLER

*EDITOR'S NOTE: Clyde R. Miller, director of the bureau of educational service at Teachers College, Columbia University, calls attention vigorously to the vital need for an honest evaluation of the function of the public schools in the present economic situation.* A. D. W.

I WAS a boy in a city in the Middle West. Half a block down the street from our home lived old Dr. Hartman.

The old gentleman strolled down the street occasionally of a summer evening to pay us a call. He liked to tell of his birth in a log cabin in the mountains of Pennsylvania, of his rise to wealth and fame. Everybody in our town called him "Old Doc Hartman."

I don't know where Dr. Hartman received his medical degree. But, like the old doctor's face, it was a conspicuous feature of the large advertisements which told every newspaper reader in the United States and Canada the virtues of the Doctor's Great Medical Discovery.

This famous remedy was a marvelous body builder, a splendid tonic. For weak, ailing women, for strong men brought low by the ravages of disease, it offered the happy road to glorious recovery, robust health. So the advertisements declared in a crescendo of declaration and repetition.

"I'm a great believer in advertising," remarked the old doctor one evening as he sat contentedly in the rocking chair on our front porch. "It is the foundation of my success." And so it was.

The important fact which Dr. Hartman knew and every patent medicine manufacturer of today knows is that Mother Nature is the great healer.

You can claim anything for any medicine, be it good, bad, or indifferent. If the patient gets well, the medicine gets the credit, though Mother Nature does the work.

In these later years the paternalistic Federal authorities have put something of a damper on patent-medicine advertising. Of course, the old technique is still used but it's more subtle.

Federal regulations, which in these later years apply to advertising, have made it expedient to use indirection in lieu of the forthright direct claims of good old Doc Hartman's era.

But the Federal authorities have taken no action in the field of political advertising and school advertising. These have been as flagrant in their claims as was the snake-oil publicity of the gay nineties. Note the recent presidential campaigns, especially that of 1928 when the Republicans paraded as the party of prosperity. Observe how, in the Coolidge era and immediately afterwards, school superintendents and professors of education attributed this same prosperity to our rapidly expanding system of public schools.

As long as good times continued, the Republicans and the school superintendents and professors were believed.

Hoover was elected in 1928 because millions believed in his great economic discovery—a political party that would abolish poverty.

Vast sums were voted for more and more schools as the Coolidge prosperity was projected into the new economic era; millions believed in increased schooling as the basis of our prosperity.

Even in 1932, the Republicans, chastened somewhat by the relentless march of events, continued to exhibit their party as the symbol of economic soundness. They were defeated, but school people are still saying, in 1933, that schools are the one way to prosperity—and school budgets are being slashed from Canada to the Gulf.

What has happened? Well, neither the Republican party nor the great increase in schooling brought prosperity. The patient in



## THE CURE-ALL FOR EVERYTHING?

this case, the American public, became dubious of the claims in behalf of the great cure-alls, the Republican party and the public schools. But does not the patient still seek prosperity? He does, indeed, and desperately. But he has decided to try something else. In politics, he has switched from the Republican cure-all to the Democratic happy-days restorative. In education he thinks he can't afford the large dosage that he took to tone up his system in the 1920's.

If prosperity comes within a year, stays and increases, Franklin Roosevelt and the Democratic party will get the credit, though the real cause may be as obscure as Mother Nature herself.

It's like switching from old Doc Hartman's Peruna to Doc Kilmer's Swamp Root when after six bottles of Peruna you still can't rid yourself of that persistent stomach misery. If Swamp Root doesn't help, you will try something else presently.

The Republican Party rode to victory in 1928 on patent-medicine publicity. As long as general conditions were good, the G.O.P. could take the credit. Mother Nature, so to speak, was on the job for the G.O.P. And all through the Coolidge era the schools were using patent-medicine publicity. Some of the politicians and most of the educators sincerely believed in their own publicity. I think Herbert Hoover was sincere; but the depression proved how mistaken he was in his prophecies of 1928. And surely, the educators have been sincere. But events have proved that they were wrong, too. A large proportion of our 12,000,000 unemployed are high-school graduates. Many are college graduates. Among the latter are highly trained specialists. It is reported that nearly 30,000 graduates of our best engineering colleges are without jobs. The number of persons trained for teaching and for whom there are no positions must be many times greater. In New York City alone are some 5,000 persons certificated to teach in the City's

schools, but they have no positions. The possession of a college degree no longer guarantees a job. One can be Phi Beta Kappa or Sigma Xi and still be jobless.

Our public schools have been pictured as the prime cause of our national greatness and prosperity.

Well, as Al Smith would say, let's take a look at the record.

Our material progress has been due first of all to the natural resources of our soil, to our rich farm lands, our timber and our minerals. Secondly, it has been due to the exploitation of these, largely through power machinery. Some of the most important machines have been invented by men well trained in university laboratories. Give the school credit for that, but don't overlook the fact that the greatest inventors and innovators of our age, Edison and Ford, were without benefits of any schooling to speak of.

However, admitting that the schools have trained many who have devised marvelous engines for the creation of wealth, we must admit in the same breath that they have done little to make this wealth available to the general public. In 1927, the heyday of the Coolidge era and of education's "great promise," 2,000,000 men were out of work; the average wage of those employed was but \$1,300. By 1929 the average wage in America was \$1,350—the high point. In 1933 about 12,000,000 men are still out of work and the average wage for this year, it is said, may drop to \$800. Education's "great promise" was not fulfilled.

We see now that the "great promise" could not be fulfilled, because it rested upon the unsound foundation of "rugged individualism." In practice this meant more and more profits to the few, the owners of the machines; low earning and purchasing power for the great majority; to an increasing number no chance to acquire any earning power.

Inherent in the philosophy of rugged in-

dividualism is the doctrine, "I'll get mine, and the devil take the hindmost."

A good part of the public has become the hindmost. We can get out of the mess we are in only as the vast resources of our nation are socialized, only as this wealth is so distributed to give to the whole public the earning and buying power essential to prosperity. This process of socialization will bring with it the knowledge that it is neither good morality nor good Christian ethics nor good public policy to predicate public policy and public education on the doctrine of rugged individualism. Nor can we continue to say: "America first, and the rest of the world go hang."

The schools can lay just claim to being the basis of prosperity only when they lay the foundation for a more equitable distribution of wealth. Can they do it? I don't know. It is a dangerous process, instantly fought by the vested interests. Many teachers, of course, don't think about the problem at all. In simple faith, they repeat the promise that schooling brings prosperity. Perhaps some are learning by this time that schooling, as we have known it, is largely the result and not the cause of whatever prosperity we have enjoyed. Perhaps some are learning that schooling and education are not the same thing.

What, then, should be the publicity program of the schools today? It should be based on what the schools are actually doing; it should shun false promises. It should reveal the schools as they are, with their virtues and their limitations. Schooling never has been, is not now, and never can be a cure-all for everything. So much can be said for our schools, even with their defects and limitations, that it is foolish to weaken this work by overstatement.

What would a sound publicity program for our schools involve?

It would reveal the schools as perhaps the greatest single welfare agency in the nation

—the agency that attempts to train children in habits of good health and wholesome recreation.

It would advocate changes in curriculum to prevent the waste of time and money on subjects which, for most children, are useless—for example, Latin, French, algebra, geometry. It would advocate abandonment of much of the vocational-guidance program; with the rapid changes in industry, much of this guidance is either useless or harmful.

It would advocate far-reaching changes in the teaching of the social sciences to bring about the socialization of wealth and the "de-emphasizing" of nationalism. It would ask for better teachers and it would honor and support good teachers. It would concern itself less with great school buildings, recognizing that a good teacher in a modest building is worth infinitely more than a poor teacher in a palace. It would try to show that good health and wholesome leisure are more important than the three R's—hence it would advocate large play spaces, it would stress the importance of music, dramatics, industrial and fine arts, and their sister subjects.

It would advocate for every community a well-organized program of adult education to assist in the solution of community and State problems—and of personal problems, too.

It would recognize that no Utopia is just around the corner; problems we shall always have. Many of these problems may never be solved, but many may be more likely of some sort of solution if attacked by honest and intelligent men and women who have been taught to believe in the greatest good of the greatest number.

A difficult program? Very, and one that requires courage as well as understanding. It cannot feature schooling as a cure-all. It must seek to make the schools and the teachers critical of themselves. It calls for abandonment of the practices of the patent-medi-

## SCHOOL NEWS

cine men and the presidential candidates. It cannot promise more than can be delivered.

If the schools truly educate, they must formulate a program of publicity as difficult as education itself. Indeed, the publicity will be the very stuff of education. To achieve a measure of success, it must liquidate part of "the stupidity of the masses."

But is this wholly stupidity? "Not entirely," it is stated in the introduction to Charles Cross's new book, *Picture of America*.<sup>1</sup> "That stupidity results from a barrage of selfish propaganda shot out of newspapers, schools, movies, and churches, all

<sup>1</sup> New York: Simon and Schuster, 1932, 78 pages.

tending to convince the worker that he is living in a world where diamonds are lying around in his backyard."

The best publicity for our schools today must critically appraise our schools as they are and it must show them as they might be.

The proper organizations to make this appraisal are the Progressive Education Association and the National Education Association. They would require the assistance of eminent laymen who have no economic axes to grind and who know social science and scientific method. They had better begin at once.

## SCHOOL NEWS

S. O. ROREM

*From New Jersey*

After a quarter century of painstaking research, study, and preparation, William S. Twitchell, dean of Paterson school principals, has at last realized his life's greatest ambition—the establishment of his own individual method of education. It is called "the Twitchell plan" and, briefly and substantially, is founded on the principle of teaching students to help themselves.

"The Twitchell plan," perhaps the first deviation in the country from what this venerable schoolmaster calls the present "chain-gang" system of education, has been in operation in the principal's Lincoln School, No. 9, for seventeen school days.

"Under this plan, the teacher will now have the opportunity to become an inspiring leader and adviser, since much of the necessity for driving and heckling will be removed."

When the Twitchell plan came into being at No. 9, the customary textbooks went out the window, so to speak. Now the youngsters do their work not over thick, impressive-looking books, but slender paper-covered "budgets."

Herein lies the key to the whole Twitchell plan. With this system each child is working individually, with a minimum of instruction, and progresses as fast as his or her aptness permits. The bright student is never retarded by the one not so bright; he or she does not have to wait five months for a promotion, because every time a budget is completed it means a promotion in that subject.

One boy, for example, has already completed

seventeen budgets, another youngster has finished sixteen. Under the standard method these pupils, despite their brilliant work, would have to take their places beside others who do not nearly measure up to them in ability. With the Twitchell plan they will forge ahead as fast as they are able to with no one or nothing to deter their advance.

*From Virginia*

The schools of Lynchburg are organizing remedial reading work in high and elementary schools.

*From Iowa*

The seventh annual institute of Emmet County boys and girls sponsored by Miss Marie Sorum, county superintendent, was held September 16 and 17. The program Friday consisted of talks to the children, drills and exhibits by the schools, band concerts, and other activities. The climax was the beautiful George Washington Bicentennial Parade Saturday afternoon. Scenes from the life of George Washington were shown on floats. Girl scouts, school bands, and 4-H club boys and girls participated.

A district meeting of the north central P.T.A. was held in Estherville also on Friday, September 16, conducted by Mrs. C. C. Colleser of Spencer. Mrs. M. P. Summers, State president, and Mrs. C. E. Roe, field worker from Washington, D.C., were present.

## OTHERS SAY

FLOYD E. HARSHMAN

### ECONOMY IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

Dr. Thomas H. Briggs, Teachers College, Columbia University, spoke before the New Jersey Council of Education on October 28. His talk related to securing certain economies in secondary education. Among other statements, the following are outstanding in his address:

After speaking of reductions in teachers' salaries, he said: "But far more important than the suffering of individual teachers is the danger to education, which is the chief instrument that society has to ensure its perpetuation and to promote its interests and its welfare. It is pitiable if a teacher or a laborer or any other human being has an inadequate income or is out of work and in want; it is worse than that, it is tragic, if society blindly endangers its own future, seeks a temporary hush for its belly at the risk of losing its safety and its future prosperity. With its ear filled with cries of distress from all types of mankind, society cannot be impressed by logical arguments that, as I wrote sixteen months ago, 'the last to profit from prosperity should not be the first to feel the pinch of depression,' or by the rhetorical appeal that the budget must not be balanced at the cost of the rights of little children. Perhaps it can be made to listen to the larger argument that education must be preserved and promoted that society itself may be preserved and its future welfare ensured."

And as one measure of economy, which will be interesting, Dr. Briggs proposed the following:

"In this time of needed economies we should at least try the experiment of large classes. Numerous research studies have concluded that results in classes far larger than we use are as good as those in what we have considered ideal small classes, if not better. To common sense these conclusions do not seem rational or reasonable, but the evidence has not been impeached by objective facts. I strongly suspect that the explanation of the superiority lies in the fact that confronted with a large class a teacher prepares an appropriate technique and exercises his best skill, while, with a small class he pursues traditional methods, neglecting opportunities for individual service on the assumption that results will naturally be satisfactory."

"Whatever the explanation, we cannot afford to ignore the conclusions of our research specialists. We are obligated at least to try the experiment of

classes of increased size. It would probably be disastrous to undertake this project without careful preparation of techniques that promise best results with large classes. This is a challenge to professional initiative and efficiency. If the results are bad, you should have carefully determined objective evidence to set before the public when you make demands for funds to restore more ideal conditions. One phase of this experiment might well be the use of extraordinarily skillful teachers to present exposition or inspiration to very large groups, the pupils then being divided into classes of reasonable size for drill and for individual work. Would they not get more in large groups from a Thatcher Clark in French or a William Lyon Phelps in literature than from John Pedant in a class of minimum size? John can drill, but he can't inspire."

The meeting of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was held at Atlantic City on November 25 and 26. Outstanding speakers on this occasion were President Mary E. Woolley of Mount Holyoke, David Lawrence of *The United States Daily*, and Carl A. Jessen, specialist in secondary education, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Jessen explained the work of his office in preparing twenty-eight bulletins now being printed to show the results of the National Survey. Those interested may secure a list of titles from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Miss Woolley spoke of moral disarmament. From her experience as a representative of the United States at Geneva last year, she brings a message of value to educationists. She proposes that we begin now to spread knowledge concerning the moral side of disarmament. She says, "War is 25,000 years old and cannot be overcome in six months. Schools can help by establishing a moral background."

David Lawrence, in speaking of the dangers of political budget cuts to education, said, "Business thinks of expenditures in terms of profits. Education, with its social view of the times, must view expenditures in terms of service. There is danger in cutting with a battle-ax instead of carefully pruning with a more delicate instrument. We must insist upon taking into account a most inclusive background."



## STRAWS IN THE EDUCATIONAL WIND

*Democracy the Essential Function of Schooling.* Education will never fulfill its really essential function until it aims deliberately to qualify the masses, one and all, for participation in the democratic general welfare. Professor Ross Finney. *Philosophy of Education*. 1928.

*Extension of the Democratic Principle.* Schools are feeling the tendency to extend the principle of democracy in its fullest exercise to include all people in the community, children as well as adults. To meet the situation requires that the school shall be completely reorganized. It must become an improved reproduction in miniature of the community. John W. Withers, Dean, School of Education, New York University. *The Need of Improved Integration*. 1929.

*Education Must Give a New Politics.* From our educational system must result a new social, political order based on intelligence and reason. Frank Cody, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, at National Education Convention. 1929.

*If the Dreams of Democracy Come True.* We must justify our democracy by demonstrating that we can make education the steadying force it must be, if the dreams of triumphant democracy shall come true. Professor William C. Bagley. National Education Convention. 1929.

*Education is Democracy.* The movement for popular rights and general welfare—that is education; it is, also, democracy. Each must devote itself to the other. Henry Holmes, Dean, School of Education, Harvard University, at National Education Association meeting. 1929.

*Saturate all the Teaching With Patriotism and Devotion to the General Welfare.* In his address to principals, William L. Ettinger, Superintendent of New York City public schools, argued that the historic and legal sanction for maintaining schools at public expense is that they should train to honest political action. "Saturate the teaching of every subject with this purpose." Ettinger's four-year term was a stubborn resistance against city hall spoilsmen, although he very well knew he would not be reflected unless he would "come along." 1924.

*Civics all the Time.* Every school class must be made a demonstration of what the patriots intended schools to be. We must instill civic and social duty all the time. Effie McGregor. *The Junior High School*. 1930.

*Ultimately Political.* Education has been a collected arrangement of factual knowledge, passed out day by day to be "recited" tomorrow. All edu-

cation must be social, civic, and ultimately political. John Dewey. *The Nation's Schools*. November, 1931.

*Education to Make Democracy Safe.* Jefferson's proposal was to render education the means by which people would know their rights of controlling their government. He wrote to Cabell: "I am convinced that the information of the people at large can alone make them safe." His letters to Washington show the conviction that educating the people is for the purpose of preserving the Republic. In Jefferson's outline he includes these aims for education: to enable the citizen to understand his duties to his country and to discharge them with competence; to choose with discretion those whom he delegates and to notice their conduct with diligence, candor, and judgment. He said, "To instruct the mass of our citizens in these their rights, interests, and duties are the objects of education. Thomas Jefferson and Education in a Republic. Charles Arrowood. 1930.

*Schools are for Good Government.* In lean years taxpayers have reasons to question the schools. Now even parents are doing it. Few realize that education is a long-term investment in those institutions of living together which made our government, our commonwealth. It takes money from everybody without asking whether the taxpayer loves little children or wishes to help them. Education is not polite culture, not a benevolence, but a loan. The managers of schools need a profound realization of this fact, that the schools are founded on a promise of preserving and improving good government. Professor Thomas Briggs, Inglis Lecture, Harvard University, *The Great Investment*. 1930.

*Training Not Only "For" But "In" Citizenship.* American citizenship is atrophied from lack of exercise. We have wholesale violation of law, increase in juvenile crime, delinquency, neglect of civic duty, indifference. Schools were made a public charge to prevent these evils. Training for participating citizenship is more important than 99 per cent of what the schools now do. Professor George W. Diemer, Blanche Mullen. *Pupil Citizenship*. 1930.

*Why We Have Public Schools.* To overcome crime, vice, intemperance, and other obstacles to civic health these public schools were organized at public cost. They must teach the facts about these vital matters and the duty of attending to them. Grove Dow. *Society and its Problems*. 1930.

## BOOK NOTES

MILDRED BATCHELDER

**W**HAT is geography—what does that word mean to readers? Would not the answer probably indicate that geography was a subject which the reader had once studied in school? If pressed further, one might answer that it had to do with the location of countries on our globe, the height of their mountains, the aridity of their deserts, the productions and manufactures of various areas. Possibly maps might be mentioned. In the better schools of today the conception of geography has gone far beyond this, endeavoring to make it possible for a person to have an intelligent perspective not only towards his own country but towards other countries of the world, towards their development and towards their interrelation. But these developments in teaching have come in comparatively recent years. There are many people who still seem to remember their geography as just one subject in the curriculum and use it in their adult life as a help in making vacation itineraries or in locating some of the multifarious places mentioned in new air-mail routes. It seems taboo to use it in thinking about international relations, for example. Perhaps the people who fit into such a category would not consider reading a book which is called a geography but, if so, what a treat they will miss when they pass by *Van Loon's Geography* (Simon and Schuster).

The jacket of the book gives us immediate insight into Mr. Van Loon's attitude. "We are all of us fellow passengers on the same planet and we are all of us equally responsible for the happiness and the well-being of the world in which we happen to live." He begins by putting the human race in its place—and a very small amount of actual space it occupies. After that he admits that his interest in this volume is particularly with this same small group of people, why they live in one place rather than another, why they have moved about at different times,

and what changes those moves have brought. Before beginning on the individual continents, Mr. Van Loon digresses to encourage his readers to make pictures, to make their own maps and interpretations of geographical facts. This idea, a favorite with the author, has resulted in many original and very satisfying maps and sketches shown throughout his book—cross sections of sea coast, all the high mountains put in the Pacific's deep hole with no summit sufficiently high to reach the surface of the ocean, or a comparison between the earth surrounded by layers and layers of atmosphere and a man keeping warm with many layers of covers over him.

Europe is the first continent to have attention and it has the lion's share of the book. This is not surprising when Mr. Van Loon's method is understood. Here are many countries. What is the geographical reason? There is not always a geographical explanation. Other factors enter in, of course. Sometimes, from a geographer's point of view, the wrong city or the wrong country rose to prominence. Here in geography is the beginning of history.

There are dozens of quotable parts but once started on them there seems no place to stop. Here is one short paragraph at the end of the chapter on Switzerland: "Life is too difficult and too dangerous to encourage the amiable philosophy of 'muddling through.' Somewhere, somehow, some one is forever watching, observing, paying attention. That such a general tendency towards a rather schoolmasterish punctuality and efficiency does not make for artistic success is a well-known fact. In the line of literature and the arts . . . the Swiss have never produced anything that has traveled far beyond their own confines. But then the world is full of 'artistic' nations while only a few can boast of centuries of uninterrupted political

## BOOK NOTES

and economic growth and development. And the system suits the average Swiss and his wife. What more can we ask?"

The following titles are selected from *The Booklist*, published monthly by the American Library Association.

*The March of Democracy; the Rise of the Union*, by JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, 428 pages, illustrations and maps, \$3.50.

The well-known facts of American history are made into a readable narrative by the historian whose ability to present history with breadth of view and vividness was demonstrated in his *Epic of America*. While that book was an interpretation, this one is a factual account. Illustrated with many old prints and facsimiles. A second volume will carry the history from the outbreak of the Civil War to the present.

*On the Meaning of Life*, by WILLIAM JAMES DURANT. New York: Long and Smith, 1932, 144 pages, \$1.50.

"What is the meaning, or worth, of human life?" was the question addressed by the author to a heterogeneous group of prominent people. The letters of the twenty-seven who answered—most of them literary men—are printed in full. The author provides a running commentary and, as a setting, gives an able exposition of a philosophy of discontent.

*Managing One's Self*, by JAMES GORDON GILKEY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932, 238 pages, \$1.75.

Common difficulties of emotional adjustment and personal relationships are considered in the light of practical psychology and what the author terms "applied Christianity." Simply written and inspirational.

*More Merry-Go-Round*, by the authors of *Washington Merry-Go-Round*. New York: Horace Liveright, 1932, 482 pages, \$3.00.

In this ruthless and occasionally scandalous close-up of prominent people in Washington, the victims are politicians, generals, judges, lobbyists, and cabinet members. It is lively reading, and there is sufficient basis of truth in the revelations of activities in governmental circles to make it informing, but much of it is mere retailing of petty and malicious gossip.

*Bloody Years; a Decade of Plot and Counter-Plot by the Golden Horn*, by FRANCIS YEATS-BROWN. New York: Viking Press, 1932, 312 pages, \$2.75.

The first third of the book sketches political activities in Turkey from 1908 to 1914. The remainder records the author's experiences as a prisoner of war for two and a half years in Turkey, referred to in *The Lives of a Bengal Lancer*. Vivid characterizations, anecdotes, and humor enliven his writing; the suffering endured and cruelty seen are not emphasized.

*A Rabbit in the Air; Notes from a Diary Kept While Learning to Handle an Aeroplane*, by DAVID GARNETT. New York: Brewer, Warren and Putnam, 1932, 117 pages, illustrations, \$1.50.

Mr. Garnett's delight in the sky and the earth and in his slowly acquired proficiency in handling the machine, as well as his discouragement over failures, are recounted in this simple account, in diary form, of his learning to fly. The author's sensitive imagination and narrative skill make even his simplest writing distinguished.

*Peter Ashley*, by DU BOSE HEYWARD. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1932, 316 pages, \$2.50.

This finely conceived and beautifully written novel pictures a brief period in the history of Charleston in the sixties. Peter Ashley, returning from Oxford to a city whose political and social life was almost disrupted by the impending war, found that his cosmopolitan education had resulted in a sympathy for the Union which made it impossible for him to give himself whole-heartedly to the South to which he belonged by tradition and inclination. In the end he goes to fight for secession.

*Reading, Writing and Remembering; a Literary Record*, by EDWARD VERRALL LUCAS. London: Harper and Bros., 1932, 341 pages, illustrations, \$4.00.

The reminiscences of this English essayist, the author of sixty books, constitute a literary rather than a personal autobiography, a record of the circumstances and the personalities that affected his career. Associated for many years with the literary world as journalist, author, and member of the publishing house of Methuen, his acquaintance with writers was wide and his anecdotes are enlightening and good humored.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Art and Nature Appreciation*, by GEORGE H. OPDYKE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932, xvii+564 pages, \$3.50.

This is not a formal textbook; it was written for the adult who wishes he knew how to appreciate art, especially painting, but is unable to. However, there is no reason why it should not be used in college or mature high-school groups.

Mr. Opdyke has divided his subject matter into six main sections: Art, which treats the relationships and differences between the arts and between art and nature; Light and Dark; Color; Light and Dark Plus Color; Line, Form, Mass; and Composition. It will be seen that the author uses painting as his chief illustration, but many of his remarks can be applied as well to the other arts.

An unusual feature of this book is the quotations from other authors following each chapter. Besides amplifying and reinforcing the opinions expressed in the chapter, they serve as a bibliography for further study on that topic.

F. W. SWIFT

*World History*, by CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PARKER THOMAS MOON, and JOHN W. WAYLAND. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932, 912 pages.

There is often a wide discrepancy between the claims for a book as set forth by the author in the preface and the content of the book itself. In *World History*, by Hayes, Moon, and Wayland, the authors have "made a special effort to put the present text in language that will be readily understood and actually enjoyed by beginners in secondary school. . . . It is brief; it is frankly introductory; but it is, we believe, coherent. It does tell a running story of man all the way from the earliest age of hunters to the age of big business, from the Neanderthals and Cro-Magnons to Bolsheviks and Fascists."

This is a big order—to write a world history in one volume of 900 pages of large type, and plentifully supplied with pictures, maps, and teaching aids, and at the same time tell a coherent story that will be readily understood and actually enjoyed by beginners in secondary school. Of course, this is an ideal that is manifestly impossible of actual accomplishment. The history of the world is too voluminous, comprehensive, and complex to be treated adequately in one volume of the dimensions of the work under review. The pictures that are drawn are sketched too dimly to make much of an impression.

Yet there is a definite demand and a real need

for just such a work in the high schools of this country. And this need is admirably met by the authors of *World History*. The defects are inherent in the subject, not in the authors. Perhaps too many topics are treated. It is often better to leave out material altogether than to treat it vaguely. However, the authors have given us a good work—one of the best in the field.

DUDLEY F. MCCOLLUM

*Creative Writing of Verse*, by H. AUGUSTUS MILLER, JR. New York: American Book Company, 1932, xv+190 pages.

Mr. Miller has written this book on the theory that the first principle in learning to write poetry is to learn the mechanics of versification. Assuming this, the book is very well developed. It opens with a chapter on rhythm followed by two chapters on the Soul of Poetry and Originality. The remaining chapters are devoted to various other phases of mechanics, such as Melodic Devices, The Stanza, Poem Forms, and the like. At the end is found a group of very high grade poems written by high-school students. One of the best things about the book is the excellence of the poems, both old and new, used as illustrations throughout.

Some teachers may differ with Mr. Miller on his assumption that a knowledge of versification is the first step towards knowing how to write poetry. Many feel that the student should be encouraged to write as soon as he has an idea, and that the more formal elements should be a later step. Such teachers, although differing with the principle of the book, might easily find value in it as a reference, for when the pupil's interest in verse forms and meters has been aroused, this will be a very good book to put into his hands. In either case, the collection of poems at the end is an excellent proof of what can be done by high-school students if they go about it.

F. W. SWIFT

*Survey Field Book for the Analysis of a High School Building*, by N. L. ENGELHARDT. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931, 45 pages, 85 cents.

The Strayer-Engelhardt score card and standards for high-school buildings have been very widely used by administrators. As a supplementary device to facilitate its adequate use, Professor Engelhardt has now published a very adequate checking list, wherein may be recorded the information on which is based the score given to each item on the score card. By the use of this field book, there



## BOOK REVIEWS

is an orderly arrangement of field notes—the original data of the survey of each building.

P.W.L.C.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*American General Education*, by ANDREW FLEMING WEST. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

*A Teacher's Guide Book to the Activity Program*, by ROBERT HILL LANE. New York: The Macmillan Company.

*How to Study*, by A. E. McNELLY. New York: Lyons and Carnahan.

*Education as Guidance*, by JOHN M. BREWER. New York: The Macmillan Company.

*Coaching High School Athletics*, by WILLIAM G. CAMPBELL, RALPH K. REED, and HOWARD JONES. Los Angeles, Cal.: University of Southern California Press.

*Achievement in the Junior High School*, by BANCROFT BEATLEY. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

*Adventures in Dictionary Land*, Books One, Two, and Three, by E. E. LEWIS, C. WOODY, J. ROEMER, and W. L. MATTHEWS. New York: American Book Company.

*Art and Nature Appreciation*, by GEORGE HOWARD OPDYKE. New York: The Macmillan Company.

*The Dark Places of Education*, by WILLI SCHOBBAUS. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

*Some Effects of Incentives*, by JOSEPH ZUBIN. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Scott's Quentin Durward*, edited by WILLIAM T. BREWSTER. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

*Cooper's The Last of the Mohicans*, edited by C. T. CROWTHER. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

*Macaulay's Life of Johnson*, edited by A. P. WALKER. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

*Milton's Select Poems*, edited by A. P. WALKER. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company.

*The Homeroom Pupil and the Homeroom Teacher*, by MARK D. GORDON and HENRY C. SEASHOLES. Newark, Ohio: Neighbor and Riggs, Inc.

*An Experimental Study of Superstitions and Other Unfounded Beliefs*, by OTIS W. CALDWELL and GERHARD E. LUNDEEN. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Health Studies*, By F. M. GREGG and HUGH C. ROWELL. Yonkers: World Book Company.

*The Paris Pact*, by ARTHUR C. WATKINS. Wash-

## for the second semester EVERYDAY ECONOMICS

by JANZEN and STEPHENSON, now being extensively used for a full year's course in economics, is equally well adapted for a one-semester course. The text complete plus a majority of the "Questions on the Text" furnishes a minimum course which can be adequately covered in a half-year's work. If you are conducting such a course and are interested in a thoroughly up-to-date book for the February-June term, may we send you further information?

## modern language readers

### FRENCH

La Lecture Expliquée  
Ménagerie Intime  
Mes Premières Lectures  
Nos Amis Les Bêtes

### SPANISH

En España  
Lecturas Fáciles  
Notas de un Estudiante  
Selecciones Poéticas  
Zaragüeta

May we send you information about any of these books?

## SILVER BURDETT

NEW YORK  
NEWARK  
BOSTON  
CHICAGO  
SAN FRANCISCO



*The*  
**PROGRESSIVE  
EDUCATION  
ASSOCIATION**

invites you to participate in

- the Annual Conference to be held in Chicago, February, 1933.
- the development of regional groups and conferences in your vicinity
- the work of national committees on social-economic problems, secondary schools, rural schools, teacher training
- the thoughtful appraisal of modern education through the pages of PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION.

*Membership three dollars a year*

**THE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION  
ASSOCIATION**

716 Jackson Place Washington, D.C.

Important new books at attractive low prices through special combination offers with PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION. Send for your list today.

**Science Education**

**Devoted to the Teaching of Science  
in Elementary Schools, Junior and  
Senior High Schools, Colleges and  
Teacher Training Institutions**

**CHARLES J. PIEPER, Editor**

New York University  
32 Washington Place, New York City

**EARL R. GLENN, Business Manager**

State Teachers College  
Montclair, N.J.

SCIENCE EDUCATION is published quarterly in October, December, February and April. The subscription price is \$1.50 a year; \$2.00 in Canada and other foreign countries. Single copies are 40 cents; 50 cents in Canada; 60 cents in other foreign countries. Prices on back numbers on request to Business Manager.

ington, D.C.: National Student Forum on the Paris Pact.

*The Art of Behaviour*, by **FREDERICK WINSOR**. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company.

*Scientific Method*, by **TRUMAN LEE**. New York: The Macmillan Company.

*Efficiency in College Management*, by **JOHN DALE RUSSELL**. Bloomington, Indiana: Bureau of Co-operative Research, Indiana University.

*The Effectiveness of Large Classes at the College Level*, by **ALBERT E. BROWN**. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

*The Elimination of Technical Errors in Written Composition Through Formal Drill*, by **JESSE E. THOMAS**. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

*Teacher Supply and Demand in Iowa*, by **E. R. PETERSON, E. F. LINDQUIST, H. A. JEEP, and M. P. PRICE**. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

*The Fundamentals of Learning*, by **EDWARD L. THORNDIKE**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Character in Human Relations*, by **HUGH HARTSHORNE**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

*Educating for Citizenship*, by **GEORGE A. COE**. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

*Cultural Natural Science for the Junior High School*, by **P. A. MAXWELL**. Baltimore, Md.: The Williams and Wilkins Company.

*A Program of Art Education*, by the Connecticut State Board of Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

*Directed High School History Study, Book Two*, by **ALICE MAGENIS and MADELINE F. GILMOUR**. Yonkers: World Book Company.

*The History of Transportation in the United States*, by **MARY W. MACNEEL**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Teaching Honesty Through Activities*, by **EDNA A. COLLAMORE and VERNON JONES**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*The Radio Enters the Classroom*, by **MARY ROEDER and MARY URMSTON**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Education and the Social Crisis*, by **WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK**. New York: Horace Liveright.

*The Operation and Effects of Single Salary Schedule*, by **ROSEWELL PAGE BOWLES**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Content of Student-Teaching Courses*, by **JOHN G. FLOWERS**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

*Admission of Students as Candidates for Master's Degree*, by **JOSEPH R. MACNEEL**. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.